

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, June 20, 1961.

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to the Proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. B. H. Teusner) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr. G. D. Combe) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.15 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Governor's Speech. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.46 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

NEW MEMBER FOR FROME.

Mr. Thomas Mannix Casey, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the House as member for the district of Frome, in place of Mr. Michael Raphael O'Halloran (deceased).

[*Sitting suspended from 12.52 to 2.15 p.m.*]

DEATH OF GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

The SPEAKER informed the House that he had sent a message of sympathy to Viscountess Dunrossil on the death of His Excellency the Governor-General Viscount Dunrossil and in reply thereto had received the following telegram from the Official Secretary, Government House, Canberra:

Lady Dunrossil sends her thanks to you, members and officers of the House of Assembly, and wishes me to say that she and her sons are grateful for your kind message.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which Speech I have obtained a copy which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1962.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer), having obtained the suspension of Standing Orders 43 and 44, moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Governor's Speech and a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to draw attention to a very important matter that was referred to in the press on August 18 last year. In an article relating to the expansion of the University at the Bedford Park site the Treasurer was reported as follows:

The Commonwealth Universities Commission was prepared to recommend financial help to develop the Bedford Park area. Legislation would be introduced soon to authorize the spending of up to £30,000 on the development and beautification of the Bedford Park site for University expansion. A condition would be that the buildings should be developed and retained by the University of Adelaide for a university hostel or university residential college, with first priority for country students. A Bill would be introduced to State Parliament soon to enable the Government to grant the land and buildings to the University.

I am still waiting for it. The press report continues:

The Bedford Park hospital would be included in the land granted to the University for use as a hostel or residential college.

The press article stated that the report from the architects of both the Commonwealth Universities Commission and the Adelaide University was that the site was ideal for expansion. I believe the Treasurer would agree with that. On August 19 I made certain comments, which were also reported in the press, but I am more concerned that I have received no advice from the Treasurer that the Government has altered its policy in relation to the utilization of the Bedford Park area as a second university site, and I had hoped that, on this matter, the Government's policy would be in agreement with the Labor Party's policy which is for a second university to be called the University of South Australia to be set up now. This should be independent of Adelaide University and should have a metropolitan site for which Bedford Park seems suitable. The second university should, at opening, provide courses in arts, science and economics, and plan for the clinical years of a medical school in 1967. Attached to it should be an associated university college in a country area with faculties of arts, science and rural economics, and which can provide for country teachers' training.

I firmly believe that when the Treasurer made his press announcement he was mindful of the need for a second university. He intimated then to the press (and not to Parliament) that £30,000 would be made available

for beautifying the site. That indicates that he favoured the proposal. We then go a step further, and again must refer to the press for information. I refer to the following *Advertiser* report of statements made by the Chief Secretary on January 28, 1961, regarding the use of the site:

The Government had agreed that Bedford Park should be made available to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department until it was needed by the University, the Chief Secretary (Sir Lyell McEwin) announced yesterday. This action was being taken because of the big increase in the number of children committed to the department. Accommodation has been considerably strained with the number of children in institutions increasing by 50 per cent in five years.

The Government had been well aware of that, according to this article. The report continues:

Because of this increase, new buildings planned will not be ready in time to take all the children needing care. During its temporary occupancy the Children's Welfare Department proposed to use Bedford Park for three main purposes—as: an intermediate institution for boys, an institution for selected girls, and a remand home for selected boys and girls. It would be possible to accommodate both girls and boys at Bedford Park because the property was large and buildings were widely separated. The security section for 20 boys was opened at Magill last year. Struan Farm School, near Naracoorte, also provided rural training for selected boys.

The Chief Secretary's statement was certainly not in harmony with the Treasurer's announced policy. I do not understand this split within the Cabinet, but apparently it is there, as we were promised a university and told that £30,000 would be set aside for the development of this site for that purpose, but we are still waiting for the £30,000. In view of the statements by the Treasurer and the Chief Secretary, on February 9 I wrote to the Chief Secretary, as follows:

I have noticed in the press that the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department will be permitted to use the Bedford Park hospital property and that an officer of the department is already in residence. I have also ascertained that at the present time there is a matron, two sisters, 11 nurse-attendants, one male medical orderly, one female occupational therapist and 14 porters, who also do the work of the wardsmen; 10 of them are ex-patients. There are also two male cooks and one female cook, one male sculleryman and an acting lay superintendent together with farm employees. I would appreciate your views as to whether the personnel mentioned will be provided with a continuity of employment in similar positions to the ones they now occupy.

I also led a deputation to the Chief Secretary, who told the deputation that all the personnel for whom suitable employment had not been

found at that time would eventually be found employment with continuity, and we accepted that assurance. My letter continues:

The Housing Trust inspected this property but rejected it as unsuitable for its purposes. We were then informed that the university proposed to extend its activities to that area. These various changes of front by the Government indicate to me that the Government is very uncertain about the future of this property, and may I suggest that no firm commitments be made until after Parliament meets, when a Parliamentary Select Committee can be appointed in order to report to Parliament and resolve the matter for all time.

I thought that was a reasonable approach to this matter. On February 15 I received a reply from the Chief Secretary who acknowledged receiving my letter and said that my suggestion would be considered. I am still waiting to know whether it has been considered. That is the only acknowledgment of my letter that I have received. I now go a step further. In the *Mail* of May 27 appeared the following report of a further statement by the Chief Secretary:

A new era in training and rehabilitation will open soon for boys committed to Magill Reformatory. Selected boys will be transferred to a new training institution being established by the Government at Bedford Park. It was handed over on Wednesday (May 24) to the Children's Welfare Department, the Chief Secretary, Sir Lyell McEwin, said today. About 40 boys will be transferred as a beginning. All will be boys, 14 to 18, whose conduct at Magill has indicated they will respond to the better living conditions and type of training Bedford Park will offer. It has more than 20 good buildings set in large and attractive lawns and gardens. The buildings include an administrative block, comfortable staff quarters, five wards which can be easily converted into boys' dormitories, a large recreation room with a stage for concerts, two well equipped workshops where the boys can learn carpentry and metal work, and a building suitable for a gymnasium.

The property covering about 400 acres . . . was run as a small farm, orchard and market garden to provide for the needs of the hospital. As a boys' institution, it will continue to be run on those lines. The hospital's farm staff and implements, including tractors, header, and combine, have been retained to train the boys in agriculture and horticulture. On the property are 600 Corriedale sheep, 100 large white pigs, 2,000 fowls, large incubator, vegetable garden, and many vines and fruit trees. The boys will have no guards or high fences. They will be on their honour not to run away. The changeover from a hospital to a boys' institution is being supervised by Mr. J. Dench.

Sir Lyell said one building at Bedford Park, the two-storey nurses' block, would be used to accommodate 20 girls until the Vaughan House programme was more advanced. An 8ft. high galvanized iron fence has been built around

it to keep it completely enclosed and separated from the boys' section. Up to 20 girls will be kept there. Some will be girls on remand awaiting trial. They will be segregated from the other girls. Conversion of this section is almost finished and it will be occupied in the next week or two.

I have been to Bedford Park; I inspected it before it was handed over and found that the nurses' quarters have been converted to take up to 20 girls. My information is that they are 20 girls from Vaughan House. The building lends itself to providing single rooms, and I do not object to single rooms being provided. However, the doors have been altered to allow for glass inserts, presumably so that the behaviour of these people can be observed. In addition, all doors have been fitted with yale locks and dead locks (extra special locks) but I maintain that, if people are to be kept inside, screws should not be fitted on the inside of these doors, as has been done. I know little about security blocks, but I consider that these people need only obtain a screw driver to be able to get out.

The building is well elevated, and, despite the 8ft. high galvanized iron fence, any person in the northern section of the building will have one of the nicest views obtainable anywhere in the metropolitan area. Conditions will be most congenial from that point of view. However, I doubt whether one could find 12 square feet of level land, so I do not see how these people will get the necessary exercise.

The Chief Secretary mentioned the question of trusties from Magill. Earlier, the Opposition supported the acquisition of land at Struan, near Naracoorte. The department has more than 1,100 acres at Struan, and not more than 15 lads are there from Magill. Those boys are trusties, and they are sent there to be trained in the way the Chief Secretary has mentioned, namely, to learn something about farming and the care of cattle. The Bedford Park area has some cows and provides for vegetable growing in a small way, but I point out that when it was a hospital it was worked by five farm employees. They grew cereals there, and in fact cereals are still under cultivation this year. They also kept some sheep, and at one time they had one of the best stud piggeries this State has ever seen.

The House knows that it was often necessary for me to raise certain matters in the interests of Bedford Park when it was used as a hospital. I have made representations for certain necessary equipment for that establishment and

sometimes, after long delays, that equipment was made available. The Chief Secretary referred to the metal work done at Bedford Park. Can the Treasurer say whether the Commonwealth Government provided all the equipment, and if it did, what the cost was? I do not wish to reflect on those whose task it is to decide who are to be the trusties. I can only accept the statements that appeared in the *Mail* on May 27, which represent a complete contradiction of the earlier statement and which are contrary to what was announced by the Treasurer when this matter was first considered. Why the alteration? Why is it necessary now to say that these lads are to be trained in open spaces?

About 18 years ago the Superintendent of the Glandore Home took all the locks away, opened the gates and even dismantled some fences, and I am pleased to say that most of the lads who go to Glandore never go on to Magill. The exceptions are those who fall by the wayside in their later years. That area at Glandore is still open, and not much difficulty is experienced in keeping the boys there. However, let us look at what has happened at Magill from time to time. At Magill there are enclosures, and staff is in attendance 24 hours of the day. Bedford Park will have the chalets that were used by the patients. The accommodation will be roomy, and there will be no fences. I can think of many attractive places those children may decide to visit, particularly during the hours when they will not be working.

The Chief Secretary's statements are contradictory. We have no way of knowing, for instance, what schooling these children will have at Bedford Park, or whether the Education Department will supply the necessary teachers for those between 14 years and 16 years. I do not know that Mr. Dench will be able to attend to all these things.

I can never understand the policy adopted by this Government on this very important matter, particularly when I read in the press that the University of Adelaide intends to limit the number of students in certain faculties. Which is the most important from a common-sense point of view? Would it not be better to use Struan Farm, where there is the necessary land to train these boys, and to make more university accommodation available at Bedford Park in order to teach and train the future citizens of this country and thus enable us to advance? I am more than surprised to know that the leader of the Government held a different view last August from that of the Chief Secretary

now. It is wrong. Bedford Park should be used entirely as a university site and developed without loss of time.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): A matter that should be brought to the notice of the public is the transfer of a well established industry in the country to a place near the city. Nothing we have heard today will bring a word of comfort to those people who through no fault of their own find themselves in a state of economic unbalance. To build up a strong and healthy nation, there must be freedom from fear. To achieve that, there must be in office a Government whose word the people can accept.

Since this House went into recess last year, one thing at least has taken place that can hardly justify anybody's accepting the word of the present Government for it has broken faith not only with a certain section of the people but with a committee appointed some years ago to assist the Government in setting up industry, to make recommendations to it about the granting of moneys for industry to expand and, at the same time, to safeguard the State against waste.

I refer this afternoon to the Industries Development Committee. If ever a committee was embarrassed, it was this committee the day it visited Wallaroo as the special committee appointed in the last session of Parliament to hear evidence and report upon what steps should be taken to encourage new secondary industries or branches of existing industries to establish in country districts. On the very day the committee visited Wallaroo, the management of the Wallaroo Clothing Company, now operating at Elizabeth as Ernest Wirth and Kentish Clothing Company, saw fit to give notice that the Wallaroo factory would cease to operate within the next fortnight. It can be seen at a glance that an important principle was breached on that day. It is appalling that the company should be allowed to do this after giving the undertaking it did to the Industries Development Committee that, if allowed to expand its business at Elizabeth, it would continue the well established business at Wallaroo.

This undertaking was conveyed to the House through the Treasurer in reply to a question I directed to him on May 12, 1960. There was a strong suspicion that this company would cease to operate at Wallaroo once it became established at Elizabeth. Several reasons caused that matter to be brought before the

House last year, the main one being that certain people had gone out of their way to convey to the people at Wallaroo that they were barking up the wrong tree, that their fears were really unfounded. This made them all the more suspicious: hence my question to the Treasurer. To refresh the minds of honourable members, I will read both my question and the answer I received from the Treasurer. They are as follows:

In view of strong rumours circulating among prominent business men in the Wallaroo district that the Wallaroo Clothing Company will cease to operate in that town towards the end of the year, and because of a letter which I understand has been received by all employees attached to the factory at Wallaroo asking whether they would be prepared to transfer to Elizabeth, will the Premier say whether an undertaking has been given to the Government by the company referred to that the establishment of the factory at Elizabeth will not affect the continued operation of its Wallaroo factory?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Representatives of the company interviewed me some time ago with a view to establishing a factory at Elizabeth. I informed them that the Government was not interested in moving an already established company in the country to another location, but said that it would give further assistance to enable the company to extend its activities at Wallaroo. The company said that a number of things prevented its undertaking such an expansion and asked, as an alternative, that it be allowed to establish a portion of its business at Elizabeth, provided it maintained the present business at Wallaroo, and that matter went before the Industries Development Committee. I have not spoken to the chairman of the committee but I have no doubt that the same assurance was given to it. I know the committee would be most anxious for that to be the case. I have no hesitation in saying that the Government would assist in establishing the industry at Elizabeth only on the distinct understanding that it was not in any way at the expense of the Wallaroo factory.

The Treasurer's reply was passed on to the people of Wallaroo, who were informed by me that their fears were unfounded. This incident serves as but one further warning to the people of South Australia of the unreliability of the sources of information, because late in November, 1960, I was requested to meet an officer of the clothing company at Wallaroo. I received a jolt at the interview on being told that in a few weeks' time a big percentage of the employees would be transferred to Elizabeth and others would be dismissed. The very thing was going to take place that this House was informed would not happen. Immediately, the matter was discussed with leading citizens in my district,

and the following letter was forwarded to the Treasurer:

On 12th May last I directed a question to you in the House concerning the Wallaroo Clothing Company. I was seeking information whether an undertaking had been given the Government by the company that the establishment of a factory at Elizabeth would not affect the continued operations at Wallaroo. You gave a very satisfactory reply, and it was printed in the daily and local papers. My constituents were delighted with the latter part of your reply—"I have no hesitation in saying that the Government would assist in establishing the industry at Elizabeth only on the distinct understanding that it was not in any way at the expense of the Wallaroo factory." Recently, I was requested to meet an executive member of the company and was advised by him that during the Christmas holidays a number of employees from the Wallaroo factory would be transferred to Elizabeth, and others would be dismissed. Due to causes brought about by the building of the industry at Elizabeth, out of approximately 100 employees only 29 will be retained for work at the Wallaroo factory. The above advice came as a great shock after the assurance from you that the industry at Elizabeth would not be at the expense of the Wallaroo factory. I think you must agree that if this is allowed to take place the expense to the local community will be very costly. The business people will be seriously affected, with the result that hardship will be felt throughout the whole district.

My constituents are of the opinion that in view of the assurance given them by you, through me as their representative, that I approach you and request the whole matter be investigated with a view to having the company honour the undertaking it must have given the Industries Development Committee. I trust you will give this matter your personal and urgent attention.

I received an acknowledgment from the Premier's Secretary, but there was no comment from Sir Thomas Playford on my representation. However, I received a further letter dated December 15, 1960, from his Secretary, as follows:

With further reference to your letter of December 1 concerning the Wallaroo Clothing Company, I am directed by the Premier to inform you that he took up the matter with the governing director of Kentish Clothes Limited, and a copy of his reply is enclosed.

A copy was enclosed. It was a letter to the Treasurer and not to me. Mine was a personal letter to him; it was forwarded to the governing director of Kentish Clothes Limited whose answering letter to the Treasurer was passed on to me. My constituents were ignored by the Treasurer, who should have commented on the assurance given by him in the House. The letter from the company is most interesting. It states:

Dear Sir Thomas,

In reply to your letter dated December 8 in which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. L. C. Hughes, M.P., member for Wallaroo, I feel there are several points that need explanation. I was rather surprised at Mr. Hughes' expressed shock at our plans. On several occasions when we have made decisions affecting Wallaroo we have always made it our policy to inform the local member. On February 24 last I, accompanied by my general manager, spoke to Mr. Hughes and explained to him our plans as they stood then.

That is true. I met him on that date. However, late in 1959 upon hearing a rumour that Kentish Clothes Ltd. was to build a new factory at Elizabeth, I immediately reported it to the Kadina, Wallaroo, Moonta and District Development Committee and was directed by it to communicate with the governing director and ask him to meet a deputation to discuss the company's expanding at Wallaroo rather than establishing at Elizabeth. I carried out the direction but was told that for business reasons, and in the interests of Wallaroo, a deputation would not be received: however, I would be granted an interview as member for the district.

After several requests the interview took place on February 24. I explained the anxiety of my constituents and asked one or two questions concerning the rumour: whether there was any foundation for it and, if not, whether I could put the fears of my constituents at rest. I also asked whether the expansion at Elizabeth would affect the operations at Wallaroo and the governing director replied, "I have no reason to believe that it will." In view of that, I asked whether he objected to my telling my constituents, through the local press, that there was no foundation for such a rumour, but to my great surprise he was not prepared for me to do that, nor would he make a press statement himself. I said I could see no harm in telling the people that the company would be setting up at Elizabeth, but not at the expense of Wallaroo. However, I respected his wish. He explained the company's plans as they stood then. They were that certain skilled operators would be transferred to Elizabeth, but there was no reason to believe that it would affect the operations at Wallaroo. The next portion of the letter does not agree with a recent statement made by the Chairman of the Industries Development Committee when visiting Wallaroo:

Previous to that, as you well know, Sir, the Industries Development Committee were informed of our intentions.

I do not think for one moment that the Industries Development Committee was informed that

the clothing factory would close, nor that most of the Wallaroo employees would be transferred to commence operations at Elizabeth and that others would be dismissed. So, I am at a loss to understand how the Treasurer can accept this statement after what he said in the House last year. The Industries Development Committee, through its Chairman, denies that it was informed of any such intention.

The Treasurer, when opening the new factory at Elizabeth, said that it would mean a lot to Elizabeth. The factory meant a lot to Wallaroo, Kadina and Moonta people! It is beyond me how the Government can justify its action in amending the motion of the late Mr. O'Halloran to permit a special committee to be formed to go into the country to take evidence in the hope that it may foster decentralization when it provides money for an industry already established in the country to close its doors and come to the city. The governing director's letter continues:

The relevant points covering our requirement of a new plant at Elizabeth were:

1. The demand has caused certain production problems at Wallaroo as follows: (a) We cannot obtain the highly skilled operators at Wallaroo. (b) Specialized labour will not go to Wallaroo. (c) Specialized imported labour will not stay at Wallaroo.

These points relate to production problems and the company was aware of them before it gave its undertaking to the Industries Development Committee. The letter continues:

2. To meet the demand we propose to continue doing the less skilled operations at Wallaroo and transfer the more skilled operations to Elizabeth.

3. It is felt that at Elizabeth it is more likely that we shall be able to obtain and retain the highly skilled and/or specialized quality labour essential to the maintaining of high quality of our products.

4. We must have a factory closer to Adelaide in order that we can service our clients better. As you will see from the foregoing, it has always been our intention to move a number of our staff to Elizabeth as a nucleus for our new operation. I have, of late, been a little perturbed at staff losses from Wallaroo. I feel that we could have been greatly helped in this problem by more confident comment locally than was the case.

On numerous occasions I have been approached by members of the staff concerning the future operations of the factory at Wallaroo and at all times have given them the assurance that had been given to me—that the Government would assist at Elizabeth only on the distinct understanding that it would not be at the expense of Wallaroo. What more confident

comment could be given than the word of the Government? The letter continues:

Other points that have interested me about Wallaroo have been:

(1) The opposition by local residents to imported labour, although they could offer no skills to obviate the necessity of employing people outside the area.

I have never known of any opposition by any local resident to imported labour, and I cannot see that this statement justifies itself. Although it was thought that local residents could offer no skills to obviate the necessity of employing people outside the area, the factory at Wallaroo started with about a dozen employees and was built up until over 100 were employed, so I imagine that the local people were those who could offer the skills, even though I do not think they had any opposition to outside people coming in. The letter continues:

(2) Some employees engaged in the last 10 months have only joined us on the distinct understanding that they are transferred to Elizabeth.

That may be so. Continuing:

(3) The number of natives of Wallaroo who opted to move to Elizabeth. It is obvious that they can see more opportunity for themselves and their families in such a progressive area.

Mr. Jennings: They did not have much alternative.

Mr. HUGHES: No, they did not, as the transfer of the factory to Elizabeth was being consistently brought before them and they felt insecure. This left them with no alternative but to accept the invitation to move.

The letter continues:

Whereas our plans have not changed in any major feature since we started out on this expansion scheme of ours, we do, at the moment, feel that our expansion prospects have been considerably slowed down by the financial policy of our Federal Government. Twelve months ago, when we started our expansion scheme, we foresaw no problems regarding finance and our only problem was keeping up with our commitments to our customers. Things now are somewhat reversed. We have, however, every confidence in our success, but we do feel that the Federal Government policy will bring about unforeseen changes in our thinking and planning for the near future. One point comes out of the present situation and that is that we now feel our Elizabeth project is not only necessary to enable us to increase production as required, but it is essential to enable us to:

- (1) increase our productivity and thereby reduce costs even further;
- (2) continue to increase our quality; and
- (3) draw on a large local labor pool as we need further staff.

There was plenty of labour available at Wallaroo that would have suited these people admirably if they had taken the time to train that labour as they did the imported labour. The letter concludes:

May I point out how thrilled I was at the number of applicants for jobs at Elizabeth—over 300 to date. Many of them are employed in the city and are interested in working in their home town. There has also been a large number of women applicants who have the particular skill we require. This is because of the large percentage of North Country people amongst the British migrants. I trust that the foregoing information will be satisfactory. This reply must have been satisfactory to the Treasurer and the Government or they would have made some comment to me, so I shall be pleased to hear a reply from the Treasurer regarding the transfer of this well established factory at Wallaroo to a place near the city.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I join briefly, but as forcibly as I can, with the two speakers who have preceded me in their protests about statements and assurances, or alleged assurances, that have given a false hope and brought about the spending of money and the regrets of people in two notable areas in South Australia. As this sort of thing creates a loss of faith in the Government and in the Parliamentary institution, I join with the previous speakers so that it will not be thought that they stand alone in their noble protests. We were assured that the Bedford Park site was to be used for a university and that legislation would be introduced to provide £30,000 for its development. However, we have heard no more about that legislation. We believe in all sincerity that a second university is necessary and that the spending of £30,000 is warranted. Many people, in anticipation of the building of a university at Bedford Park, bought land with the idea of building homes near a building that would improve the value of their land and homes in the future.

Mr. Riehes: It would not be with a view to speculation, would it?

Mr. HUTCHENS: It may be, but perhaps they went there in the belief that the university would be built soon. We have been told that the Adelaide University is unable to accept enrolments in certain faculties, so surely there is a need for immediate plans to be made for a second university. We are so short of hospital beds that we have less *per capita* than, I think, any other State in the Commonwealth. We need more doctors to be trained, not only for our own State

but for the near north, from which we are in danger because the people there are in need and are suppressed.

Then we were told by another Minister that the site would be used as a temporary remand home and an institution for selected boys and girls from the reformatory school. The Opposition has pointed out in the past that any home of this nature should be removed from the city to take away from the occupants the temptation to escape, yet the Government intends to set up a remand home in a place from which it will be easy to escape and obtain assistance to do so. We believe that a remand school of this kind should be removed to an area away from the city lights where at least the inmates would not be encouraged to attempt to escape. The tragedy of it all is that we are told that this is a temporary arrangement. We have so often been told about temporary arrangements.

Mr. Lawn: We have also been told that the building would be used as a second university.

Mr. HUTCHENS: We have had the experience of temporary school buildings, many of which, unfortunately, have remained longer than some members have been members of this House. The Leader of the Opposition told us this afternoon that rather substantial sums were to be spent on something temporary. I suggest that this is not only wrong to the inmates, but also an injustice to the nearby people who have built homes and whose families will be living in fear. When boys are committed to this type of home, unfortunately there seems to be the peculiar psychology to make them want to do wrong, and this could happen in the area adjacent to the proposed school. There is at Struan in the South-East a farm for selected boys on which the Government has spent a considerable sum, and yet it is not fully occupied.

Mr. Lawn: There are 15 inmates on a property of 1,100 acres.

Mr. HUTCHENS: As it is not fully occupied, is it necessary that additional money should be spent at Bedford Park, and is it necessary that the Government should delay the commencement of a second university, which is so urgently needed. It is wrong, and the work should not have been undertaken without the full approval of Parliament.

As to the complaint by the member for Wallaroo, the people there have my sympathy. No doubt many of them have spent money on homes and furniture in the full belief that the clothing factory would continue to operate and

that they would be kept in continuous employment. Mr. Hughes accepted the assurances given to him and I feel convinced that if those assurances had been honoured, the people at Wallaroo would have rendered loyal and conscientious service to the industry concerned, which is located in a town that has given so much to the State.

Mr. Shannon: Don't they have properties virtually free of rent?

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member is rather putting words into my mouth. In his usual clever style he is trying to sidetrack me into some other line of argument, but I will not be sidetracked. I am talking not about the industry, but of the employees spending money in buying homes and furniture. They do not get their houses rent free and neither do other people in South Australia under a Liberal Government; and in many cases they do not get a house for even a reasonable rent.

Mr. Shannon: I suppose that under a Labor Government they would get everything for nothing.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That is not so: unfortunately, we would have to pay for the services of honourable members like the member for Onkaparinga. The facts are that we have had too many promises. Every Thursday night we hear over the air about the spending of millions of pounds, but in the case under consideration we have had assurances given that have misled people into spending money to their regret, and this is to the detriment of the progress of the State. I join with other members in entering a protest.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I also register my protest at the change in the Government's policy in relation to the Bedford Park Hospital. I listened with interest when the Leader of the Opposition expressed the disappointment of the Labor Party at this change of policy, which was put into operation during the Parliamentary recess. I was surprised to learn recently that the member for Wallaroo had been presented with the serious problem associated with the clothing factory in his district. He and I often talk over the problems associated with our electorates and he has often expressed his concern regarding the happenings connected with the clothing factory at Wallaroo. I know that he has lost much sleep and had much heartburn over it, because he has a genuine desire, as have other honourable members, to see that their electorates are well represented and that they are not retarded in their progress

because of happenings over which they have no control. Mr. Hughes was convinced that he could report back to his electorate regarding the assurances given him by the Treasurer last year in reply to a question, but now he feels that he has been let down because those promises have not been honoured.

I understand that an assurance had been given to the Chairman of the Industries Development Committee that the company would not leave Wallaroo and that it was only establishing part of its industry at Elizabeth. Now we find that it has gone back on its assurance to the committee; and we must remember that this assurance was given so that the Government would guarantee a loan to enable it to expand its operations. If this is true, I want to know whether the Government will continue its guarantee. The honourable member put the case for his district particularly well. He set out the facts in minute detail and presented his case clearly. We on this side of the House feel that the Treasurer will reply to this matter presently and give the honourable member the assurance he justly deserves.

The speeches that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Wallaroo bear out one thing: we have been out of session far too long, having last met on November 17 last year. I believe this in itself is something about which we have a just complaint. I feel that we are to some extent curtailed in our activities through not being able to present our case in Parliament when we should have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Loveday: They don't want to hear our case.

Mr. BYWATERS: I think that is evident. The fact that we are out of session stifles our voice to a great extent, and the Government should bear this in mind in future years. I recall that last year we went into session in March and had two sessions. It was stated in the press that more business was dealt with during those two sessions than for several years yet, despite that, we did not sit for excessively long hours. On other occasions when we have had only one session we sat for long hours and into the early hours of the morning, and that could happen this year.

Apart from that, I believe the most important thing is that members should have the opportunity to come into this House at reasonable intervals, so that they may put the case for their electorates as they cannot do this effectively by letter. We know that when we ask questions in this House during the session

we get replies, but when we are out of session we have to write letters and much time elapses between the writing of the letter and the receipt of the final answer. Many people have asked me and other members at different times when we were going back into session again, and on every occasion I had to say, "Well, that rests with the Treasurer; he will tell us when we are to go back into session." We have waited and waited, and now we are back and can express ourselves in this democratic way.

I could say much more on these matters, but I feel that by entering our protest we can let the people know that it is not our desire on this side of the House to remain out of session and that we would far rather be in session so that we can express the opinions of the people we represent. Had we been in session the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Wallaroo could have expressed themselves much sooner, and this delay could have been avoided.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Leader of the Opposition in his protest about the use of Bedford Park, and I also support the remarks of the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), who spoke with sincerity and feeling this afternoon on behalf of the electors he represents. Before proceeding with those matters, I wish to associate myself with the protest voiced by the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters). We ended last session on November 17, 1960, and today (on June 20, 1961), we are meeting for the first time since then. That is an interval of seven months, during which time the Government has governed the State. In other words, one man has run the State for the past seven months, not, of course, that anyone else is going to have much say in the next five months. That is the position we have in South Australia, and we call it democracy!

Mr. Ralston: Is that the cause of all the unemployment?

Mr. LAWN: There are the questions of industry at Wallaroo, the use of Bedford Park, and unemployment, the last of which vitally concerns me and every other member on this side of the House, although it may not concern members on the Government side. We are stifled; we are not given the opportunity to speak on behalf of the people we represent regarding the large number of unemployed. I heard the Treasurer say last session that unemployment was less than 1 per cent and that it was nothing to worry about. It is 2.4 per cent today, and according to today's

Advertiser it will increase in the next two months. What has the Treasurer to say about that? Today's *News* says we can expect some improvement towards the end of the year. These are matters we wish to ventilate in this House. We are elected to speak on behalf of the people we represent, but we are denied that opportunity because we are not able to meet in this Assembly for such a long period. Like the member for Murray, I have often been asked during the recess when the Parliament is to meet again. We simply have to say, "We do not know; we have to wait until the Treasurer calls us together." We now have the opportunity to meet.

The Opposition does not wish to delay unduly the business which the Government desires to place before the House this week, so I will make my remarks brief. Last year the Treasurer led us to believe that Bedford Park was to be used as a second university. He also said that the Commonwealth Universities Commission was prepared to recommend financial help to develop the Bedford Park site. There must have been some communication between this State and the Commonwealth Universities Commission for that promise of financial assistance to have been given. The Treasurer then promised that a Bill would shortly be introduced in Parliament, and I took it for granted that it would be introduced last session. He also stated that the Commonwealth Universities Commission and the University of Adelaide were of the opinion that the Bedford Park site was ideal for expansion and utilization as a university. I took it that the Government intended to use this property as a second university. I believe that a second university is needed in the metropolitan area and that we should be planning now for another university—a third one—in a country area. I believe that this State needs a second university and, according to authorities—who should know—Bedford Park would be a suitable site.

Had the Government intended to use Bedford Park as a hospital I do not know that I would have severely criticized the proposal. I think the Government has less reason for using it as a reform home for trustees than it would have had it said, "We are overcrowded at Magill; we simply have to find other accommodation which is not available at the moment, and we have to use Bedford Park for 12 months." There might have been some justification for the Government's attitude had that been the score, but that was not the position.

It will use Bedford Park as a place for trusties. It has already had Parliamentary approval to purchase 1,100 acres of land in the South-East for these people. It seems that we shall have Bedford Park, the place in the South-East, and possibly part of the City of Adelaide might be used. It is time that the Government made up its mind. When I refer to the Government I mean the Treasurer because he is the Government. I always thought that he had a mind of his own and that he knew where he was going, but the longer I remain in this House the more I realize that he does not know where he is going. The Government says one thing today and something different tomorrow. When it suits him the Treasurer will lie to us without blushing.

Mr. Jennings: Where is he going?

Mr. LAWN: If the people had a chance they would tell him where to go, but our electoral laws are not democratic enough, and the Government does not have to go where it has been told to go. Having purchased the land in the South-East the Government should utilize it for the trusties. Why ask Parliament to agree to taking over Bedford Park? Mr. Hutchens spoke about the people who are purchasing houses near Bedford Park. I can visualize their view on the matter because I know that people living in the metropolitan area do not like factories being built near their houses. It reduces the value of the property. It is not good to have noisy factories nearby. People living near this remand home for boys will be worrying about what might happen to their wives and children. I hope nothing happens but the people living near Bedford Park will have a real concern.

Last week when speaking to one of the most prominent medical men in this State I was told that most of the graduates from our University want to do medicine. Cabinet Ministers will know whether or not this is a fact. The medical man and I both hold the view that it is not in the best interests of the State for most of our university graduates to enter one type of work. We do not want to see about 90 per cent of them doing medicine, because we want more men to go into engineering and various types of scientific research.

I have read in the press that because of overcrowding the Adelaide University has to restrict the intake of students. That should prove that it is now full and that a second university is badly needed. It was admitted by the Government when it announced last August that it proposed to use the Bedford Park site for a second university. I strongly

urge the Government to drop its present proposal. We do not know that it might not be changed tomorrow.

As far as we know at the moment, the Government intends to use the Bedford Park institution as a remand home for trusties. I suggest that it drop that proposal and go back to the August plan for a second university.

I am concerned about the number of unemployed people in South Australia. I blame the Commonwealth Government, not the State Government, for that unemployment, but our Government is of the same political complexion as the Commonwealth Government and some time this year our Treasurer will be kissing in Menzies' pocket as he tours the State asking the people to return the Menzies Government. He has done it before. He did it in 1953 when we had unemployment, albeit not so great as it is today. Our Government is not coming out with strong statements disapproving the actions of the Menzies Government, and putting forward what it believes should be done. As far as we know, our Government acquiesces in the policy of the Menzies Government and for that reason it stands condemned. That is my opinion and the opinion of the people I represent. Every morning at the unemployment bureau many people queue in the hope of getting work, but their position is hopeless. Most of them have to apply for relief. Although they earn enough when working they do not receive enough pay to provide for the time when they might become unemployed. This is a serious matter and it is getting worse. I have already mentioned the report in this morning's *Advertiser* about unemployment, and it is expected that the position for June and July will be worse. The Curtin-Chifley Government proved, and it was the first Government to do so, that Australia can have a policy of full employment, as against the Menzies Government policy of high employment. There is a vast difference between the two.

The Labor Party stands for full employment, which the Curtin-Chifley Government proved is possible. It proved that immediately after a world war lasting six years. During those years private production was thrown out of gear in favour of war production and when the war production ceased overnight the Curtin-Chifley Government saw that Australia had no unemployed people, and at the same time demobilized more than a million personnel from the armed services. Today, 16 years after the end of that world war and despite a large migration policy, we have a Government

that is following not a policy of full employment, but a policy that will throw many people out of work to prevent them from buying goods from overseas. In a nutshell, that is what the Menzies Government wants. The drift of overseas funds will put our people out of work to stop them from buying goods from other countries. What a stupid, cock-eyed policy? It is no satisfaction to the unemployed to read in today's *News* that there is a better outlook for more jobs later in the year.

Mr. Dunstan: Who said that?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know who said it. It may have been the Prime Minister; probably it was. I did not read it all the way through; I just looked at the headlines. In conclusion, I want to state that I should like the Government to get back to the policy that operated last year. For years we have been advocating two sittings a year. Last year the Government acceded to that request of the Labor Party and we sat from March until the school holidays in May; then we came back in June and carried on until November 17. We have not met since November 17 last year until today, June 20. As the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) indicated, we shall probably be sitting until 3 o'clock in the morning when we resume next month. We shall be sitting for only two or three days this week and then we shall rise until the end of July, when we shall be sitting until 3 o'clock in the morning. That is not the proper way to run a Parliament, when we boast that we are a democracy.

We are supposed to have the opportunity to speak in this House on behalf of the people we represent, debating topics like industries in the country, unemployment and other urgent matters. The Labor Government next year will call the House together much earlier—although next year may be a little unusual because we will not be in office until some time in March, and that would be the time when I should expect Parliament to be sitting. In 1963 we shall have a session commencing in March and going through the year. Then, when the present Government members are sitting on this side of the House in Opposition, we shall provide them with the opportunity of getting up and voicing all the complaints they want to on behalf of the people they represent.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I do not pose as an expert on sites for universities nor am I perhaps as conversant with city locations as are other members in this Chamber. I do not feel confident to express an opinion on which is the best site for a second university, but I

have been both impressed by what I have heard this afternoon and somewhat disturbed by what would appear to be an inconsistency on the part of the Government in its attitude towards the establishment of a second university. I hope that a second university will be established as soon as possible on the site best suited to the needs of a university, and that the paramount consideration will be the welfare of the young people who will receive training in it. I know that the existing university is, from all appearances, inadequate to cater for the needs of the State, and we are concerned to know that consideration is being given to restricting enrolments. Surely in a State such as ours that situation cannot be countenanced.

From what we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, the Government would appear to be finding difficulty in making up its mind what to do in this matter. There seems to be a delay that could be costly and hurtful to the young people who need facilities for university education. I shall listen with much interest to any reply that the Government can give to what appears to me to be the reasoned and well stated case put forward by the Leader and his supporters on this side of the House.

I have risen principally because it has been suggested to me that, as a member of the Industries Development Committee, I may be able to throw a little more light on the case presented by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). Under the amended legislation recently passed by this House, it is competent for the Housing Trust to provide land and build a factory for an industry seeking to establish itself in South Australia. That legislation has been good, and industries have grown up around Elizabeth in pursuance of the policy outlined in that legislation. Insofar as it has been responsible for enticing business undertakings from the eastern States to establish branches in South Australia, I believe that the whole State has benefited from the work of the committee but, when it comes to a transfer of industries from country districts to Elizabeth, I take the stand that it is better for an industry not to expand and to remain in the country than it is for an expanding industry to shift to Elizabeth. That is the stand I took as a member of the Industries Development Committee when this case was presented to us. In fairness to all concerned, I want to say that that is the stand that the Housing Trust and other members of the Industries Development Committee took.

The first approach from the company to the Housing Trust for assistance to establish at Elizabeth was rejected, so we were told, and it was only on the second approach, according to evidence given before us by representatives of the Housing Trust, after an assurance had been given to the Housing Trust that it was impossible to expand at Wallaroo and that the existing factory with its work force at Wallaroo would be retained, that the trust itself was prepared to consider the application. When the application came before the committee, I as a member extracted from the general manager himself the undertaking that the company would not close down at Wallaroo, that it would not retard its work at Wallaroo in any respect but that the factory at Elizabeth represented expansion that could not take place at its former establishment.

It was only after much consideration that I voted for the expansion to take place at Elizabeth. I say here and now that, had there been any indication that the factory at Wallaroo would be interfered with in any way, I should not have voted for the Elizabeth proposal, because I am firmly of the opinion that the interests of South Australia would be better served by the retention of the factory in its present state at Wallaroo than by the proposal under which there may be an expansion at the expense of the country. The member for Wallaroo is correct in stating that members of the Industries Development Committee, when visiting Wallaroo a fortnight ago, were shocked to find that not only had there already been transfers from Wallaroo to Elizabeth contrary to the undertaking given but that, on the day the committee was there, the remaining members of the staff were given notice that the factory at Wallaroo would be closed. The committee took the opportunity to inspect the factory. I believe that the member for Onkaparinga is correct and that the company was assisted by the Government's making available the premises at a peppercorn rental. I am convinced that the company did not intend to stay permanently at Wallaroo because the grounds were a disgrace to any company and the factory conditions, notwithstanding the low rent, were far from good.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The company complained when the construction of a grain elevator was mooted and said that the dust from it would come into its factory.

Mr. RICHES: I did not see much evidence of that a fortnight ago. That company, having received the buildings from the Government at

a peppercorn rental, has not played the game fairly as it has allowed the grounds and the building to fall into a state of neglect.

I was also disturbed by the claim that people will not live in the country and that executives will not go there. Other country towns have proved that statement to be wrong and I made it my business, while in Wallaroo, to discover if there were any truth in the statement. I was assured that there was no truth in it and that the employees who had transferred did so under pressure, namely, the fear that their job at Wallaroo would end. As it turned out, that fear was well grounded and if they required security in employment their only choice was to transfer to Elizabeth.

Apparently the company's word given to the committee counted for nothing and nobody placed much store on its undertaking or on the fact that it was not honoured. The Treasurer truthfully replied to the member for Wallaroo that the undertaking had been given to the chairman of the committee. The clothing company let the Government down; it let the Industries Development Committee down; and it let the people of Wallaroo down. That is the sort of thing that no self-respecting community can allow to continue without voicing strong protest. I do not know if anything could have been done when the company first indicated that it was transferring from Wallaroo to Elizabeth but I should like to hear from the Treasurer on that point. Did any discussion take place between the Treasurer and the company about any action that may have been taken to persuade it to stay in Wallaroo? The Treasurer will have great difficulty in convincing members of this House that the only reason the company had to leave Wallaroo was that people were not willing to live in country districts. Members will need something better than that and also something better than the statement in the director's letter about the difficulty in obtaining skilled labour because I point out that industry was built up at Wallaroo with the labour available in Wallaroo. It was built up to the stage where it had to expand. This is the first instance we have had of an industry having to move simply because it was too successful in the country. I require something a little more reasoned than that.

Mr. Loveday: The Whyalla shipyards were built up on unskilled labour.

Mr. RICHES: There is no evidence that the labour at Wallaroo was unskilled. All the evidence the committee had was that the garments manufactured there were of a first-class

quality that could compete with anything imported from the eastern States.

Mr. Jennings: Apparently it is transferring its skilled labour to Elizabeth.

Mr. RICHES: It is! If people will not live at Wallaroo, Kadina or Moonta how are we going to get them to live in other towns? I want to know what there is about those places that would not appeal to anybody wishing to live there. They are good, clean, healthy towns and at every place we visited the chairman said how impressed he was with the amenities provided. He also remarked on how clean and well kept the streets were. He congratulated the townspeople on that fact and I agreed with his sentiments. They are fine towns.

After the member read to the committee the letter he read to the House this afternoon the committee members were keen to look around. I wanted to explain fully that that assurance was given to the Industries Development Committee. Both the member for Wallaroo and the Treasurer were correct when they made that statement and the member for Onkaparinga was correct when he interjected that the Government had assisted by making the buildings available for little or no rent.

I believe that the people of Wallaroo have been let down by the clothing factory and I am not satisfied that the company has done all it might have done to honour the obligation it was under to approach the Government. I believe that is a serious situation and one that merits investigating by the Government. All the indications are that the Treasurer handed the letter from the member for Wallaroo to the company and asked for a reply. That seems to be the sum total of the action taken. If that is not so, I should like to know whether more action was taken because I do not wish to make an unfair assumption. If further action were not taken, that substantiates the claim that I have been making in this House year after year that some organization should be set up to investigate these things, make approaches and, in this case, find out why a company cannot continue in the town where it built up its business, established its market, made its name, and trained its personnel. To see a business go out because it is too successful and because it must grow is contrary to everything that we have seen in other country towns in South Australia. I have pleasure in supporting the representations made today by the member for Wallaroo.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): Two matters have been brought forward for discussion this afternoon: the first, introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, relates to the use of the Bedford Park Hospital (now closed as a tuberculosis hospital) for a university site, and the second to the closing of the Wallaroo clothing factory. I must confess that I have been somewhat surprised at some statements concerning Bedford Park. Initially, the late Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) asked whether the Government had considered establishing a second university and what its views were. I replied that I hoped that if a second university were established in South Australia it would be in a country area, and from the "hear hears" opposite I understood that had the unanimous approval of members. One member opposite immediately proceeded to canvass country towns asking them to prepare cases for a university in their centres, although I had said that the establishment of a second university at that time was beyond our means and could not be contemplated for many years. It was subsequently reported that that honourable member had collected some favourable applications for a second university.

As a result of a request from the Adelaide University for additional land for expansion purposes, the Government considered making available the Bedford Park site and an offer was made to the University and to the Commonwealth Universities Grants Commission. The offer was examined and reported upon favourably and the Government publicly announced its intention of making the property available for the University. Certain of the premises were not entirely suitable for university purposes and it was decided that the hospital buildings should be used as a university college to accommodate country students. Conferences were held with the Education Department and the land was inspected. Some land was to be allocated for a teachers' training college and the University was to have the remainder, except for some of the steeper land which was to be dedicated for recreational purposes and for which the Government was prepared to make an initial grant of £30,000 for beautification works. I also announced that a Bill would be drawn up to give effect to the proposal.

When I asked the Parliamentary Draftsman to draw up the Bill he reported that it was not necessary because the Government had all

the authority it needed without Parliamentary approval. I discussed with Mr. O'Halloran whether he wanted a Bill to be introduced and he said he did not believe it would serve any good purpose. The Government has power to allocate lands to the University and to the Education Department and to place an amount on the Estimates to provide necessary finance.

However, we have encountered one problem that has not yet been solved. Under its terms of reference the Universities Grants Commission cannot grant a matching subsidy on the value of land given by the Government to the University. That is obviously manifestly unfair because if the University purchases land with money that the Government supplies it can get a matching grant. The assets we intend to give to the University are worth £1,000,000, and we have modestly suggested that it would not be unfair for the Commonwealth to provide a matching grant of £200,000. I believe—and I now refer to something on which I have no direct knowledge—that for a time the commission hesitated to make a recommendation. It obtained a legal opinion and wrote to me stating that it could not recommend a matching grant in connection with land given to the University because that was outside its terms of reference.

The position now is that the Government has not altered its policy. At present it is waiting on an investigation by the Public Works Committee upon additional buildings for the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, which desires a considerable expansion in its buildings to provide for greater segregation of children. I believe the Public Works Committee has written to the department emphasizing that such segregation is desirable. The Adelaide University in any case would not be building on this land for a considerable time. It has plans for a large building on North Terrace, but I do not think this has been started. We have been shifting out rather precipitately to enable a start to be made. The buildings that will be constructed at Bedford Park have to come into operation, I think, in 1965 or 1966. In the meantime, while we were waiting on the investigation of the Public Works Standing Committee, we could not see the sense (and I do not think any member could) in having a valuable property unoccupied and deteriorating merely because it was ultimately going to be handed over to another authority when we had an authority that wanted that type of accommodation.

Mr. Shannon: There was a crying need for it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There was. All that is happening is that the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department is occupying these premises temporarily.

Mr. Lawn: When did you say: 1965 or 1966?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It was never contemplated that the university would want to have the buildings ready before 1966. In the meantime we have taken up the question of matching grants with the Universities Grants Commission and the Prime Minister. In fact, it became a topic of discussion at the Premiers' Conference only last week, when the Prime Minister immediately said, "I have no knowledge of this difficulty; it has not been referred to me, but I shall certainly get a report upon it immediately and see what can be done." Let me answer the Leader categorically on the matters he has mentioned: Bedford Park was never intended by the Government to be a second university. I emphasize that that is still the position. Whether in future years other authorities will alter that decision is a matter for the people then, as anything we do now is subject to alteration by wiser and better men later. At present, however, the Government intends to make this land available to the University of Adelaide for expansion which is necessary in certain chairs. I think the University intends to expand and to have facilities for 1,400 or 1,600 pupils at Bedford Park, and that purpose has been unaltered. There has never been any suggestion at any time that there would be any alteration. The only reason why it has been held up is that we have been awaiting a decision by the Commonwealth on what is really an anomaly in the present procedure—if we gave the University £1,000,000 and it bought Bedford Park from us it would be eligible for a matching grant but, if we gave Bedford Park to the University as land, the Universities Grants Commission holds that its terms of reference do not enable it to consider that for a matching grant.

I believe that when the Prime Minister looks at this matter in the next two or three weeks it will be completely resolved. In the meantime, in response to a query by the Vice-Chancellor, I have instructed Mr. Seaman to tell him that the University could proceed with its initial planning. There has been no alteration of policy whatever; the policy remains precisely in its original form. I am glad that the Leader and members opposite approve of it,

because I believe it will round off the University, give it the additional land it will need, and not complicate the ultimate decision about additional universities in other places.

The other matter mentioned has some rather greater difficulty. For the benefit of members I will again recite the sequence of events. During the war the Commonwealth Government established clothing factories in country towns. I think one was established at Clare.

Mr. Quirke: At Hamley Bridge; the munitions factory was at Clare.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The reason for the establishment of these factories was that a little surplus labour, which it was not possible to transfer to other activities, was available and, desiring to get the benefit of that labour, the Commonwealth Government wisely established in this State, I think, five factories. They all went out, of course, at the end of the war except the one at Wallaroo. This had a rather more enterprising management and continued to operate, but, as competition became keener after the war, it applied to the State Government for assistance to transfer its activities to the metropolitan area. The answer the State Government gave was that it had no policy that would enable it to approve that request, that it did not desire to transfer industries from the country to the city, but that its desire would be rather the other way, if it were feasible.

I am speaking from memory now, but I could check if necessary: the company made two or three approaches to the Government and finally said, "We are in a position where we cannot carry on unless we get a bigger unit production because the competition has become keener, and our price structure is wrong. Will you consider establishing another unit of our enterprise at Elizabeth?" I immediately asked, "Would that be done at the expense of the Wallaroo project?" The company said, "It is not our intention to close the Wallaroo project. We intend to retain it and get a better unit cost by having bigger production and by using the labour available at Elizabeth, which we find we cannot get at Wallaroo."

That matter was referred to the Industries Development Committee, which, I think, inquired along the same lines as the Government had done, and I think the answer it received was that the industry was not to be established at Elizabeth at the expense of Wallaroo, but was to be ancillary to the Wallaroo establishment. Let me make it quite clear that I, firmly believe that that was the company's

intention. I have found it an honourable company to deal with. As honourable members know, there has been in the last few months a complete upheaval in the clothing industry.

Mr. Hughes: Not before Christmas.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am speaking now of the last few months. Industries established in the most favourable places are today closing down their activities.

Mr. Bywaters: I wonder why!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Because they are in competition with goods produced more cheaply overseas, and that is something which this company certainly does not encourage. If it were asked its opinion it would say that it did not want free importations from overseas. So, the company cannot be blamed because there has been a completely changed economic condition in the industry. It reported to me honourably that it was not able today to honour its obligation. I am sure that if honourable members opposite stopped to think of the consequences they would agree with me when I say that I do not accept the suggestion put forward by Mr. Bywaters that we should bring this company to heel and withdraw the Government support given to it. The result would be further unemployment, because this action would result in the closing down of not only one factory, but two. From inquiries I have made I believe that this company is having the greatest difficulty in maintaining even its present standard against competition. I have made inquiries interstate and found that thousands of people in similar industries have been disemployed, and those industries are in more favourable circumstances than the one in this State; therefore, I do not accept the suggestion of the honourable member. I only hope that this company can maintain its present rate of employment and I think that the honourable member representing the district would agree with me that this would be desirable.

Mr. Clark: There are hundreds out of work in my district.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that there is much unemployment there of people who are most anxious to work. The Government has never encouraged the poaching of industries from one district to another. I remember one member of the House used to charge Mr. Bywaters with deliberately approaching one industry in his district asking it to transfer to Murray Bridge. I hope that is not correct. If any honourable member should have in his district an industry that is in difficulty, I assure him, particularly if

he is an honourable member opposite, that I will give it my utmost support in any possible way. No industry can be compelled to maintain its operations in any particular area. As regards the taking of action which would be detrimental to the future welfare of the industry, I do not think that on reflection the honourable member who put the proposition forward would agree that it would be a good proposition.

The member for Adelaide mentioned unemployment and I agree with him that unemployment is the greatest problem confronting our country at present. Let me make it clear that the Government has never accepted the theory (or philosophy, if you like), that it is necessary to have unemployment in order to control inflation. I reject that and I know that members opposite do not hold that view. Since the economic squeeze exercised by the Commonwealth Bank upon the banking system of Australia as a whole, the Government of South Australia has in fact very much broadened its expenditure.

Mr. Quirke: You say the Commonwealth Bank. Are you blaming that bank?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commonwealth authority, whichever one you like. I am not concerned at the moment in arguing that point. As I understand the matter, if members can get any satisfaction from it, I think the Commonwealth Government asked the Commonwealth Bank to exercise financial restraint through the banks. If the Leader of the Federal Opposition (Mr. Calwell) is correctly reported in the press this morning, he approves of that policy. In fact, I believe he used a considerable portion of the viewers' valuable time last night telling the Australian public that the Commonwealth Parliament should have more power so that it could exercise more restraints, but I suggest that at the moment this does not come into the question.

I return to the remarks made by Mr. Lawn, with which I entirely agree. Unemployment is not incidental only to this State, where we are very dependent upon the motor industry, which was particularly hard hit by the economic policy enunciated from Canberra. Members know that the secondary industries in this State have been built up to a large extent around the motor industry, which has been the backbone of our industrial expansion. Considering that the motor industry has had such a heavy knock, and in view of the severe measures taken against it, I believe that South Australia has emerged very well indeed. The

first thing that happened when restraint was placed upon credit was that the numbers of persons building their own homes and providing their own finance fell away almost completely and at an amazingly fast rate. Let me say that the Government activity was expanded to take up the slack, so that when members ultimately see the figures relating to houses completed in South Australia they will see that, although we may not have been able to take up the slack completely, we have been able to maintain a very high rate of permits, and I assume that the permits have been acted upon. The second thing is that whereas other State Governments have been reducing the number of people in their employ the Government of South Australia has been increasing the number in its employ. Although the Government in some ways is adversely affected by a credit squeeze just as much as is an individual, we now have in Government employ about 1,000 more people than we had when the credit squeeze was first imposed.

I think that honourable members will see from those two facts that I agree with what the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) has said. I do not agree that it is necessary to have unemployment to control inflation. This State has always maintained its power to exercise a direct control over prices, and the Governor's Speech today re-emphasizes the fact that we believe it is necessary for us to have such power. It is not that we wish to interfere with legitimate commerce, but if it is necessary at any time for action to be taken we want to be able to take it.

Mr. Lawn: Are you speaking for the member for Mitcham?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members in our Party are allowed to have their own views upon this matter. They do not have to be regimented or told what they have to do, and I have no doubt that the member for Mitcham, if he feels so disposed, will oppose not only the Prices Bill but may even go so far as to oppose the Landlord and Tenant Bill! However, I thank honourable members for their consideration of the matter.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishment and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1962, a sum of £18,000,000 be granted; provided that no payment for any establishment or services shall be

made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1961, except increases of salaries or wages fixed and prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service, or by any regulation, or by any award, order, or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Mr LAWN: I am not disagreeing with the motion, but is it not usual for the Bill to be circulated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That will be done at a later date; the Bill is not available yet.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee of Ways and Means and adopted by the House.

Bill introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill follows precisely the same form as Supply Bills of recent years. As honourable members know, the only alterations from the budgetary provisions of the year that are permitted under it are those necessary to pay any increases that might arise from an arbitration award or a decision of a wage-fixing tribunal. The amount of £18,000,000 is probably sufficient to carry the State into the latter part of October. By that time it is hoped that we shall be able to present the Revenue Estimates for the year, but I doubt very much whether it will be sufficient to carry on the State until they are passed. We always have difficulty in getting the Auditor-General's report available at the same time as the financial papers. The practice has been rather to delay the financial papers until the Auditor-General's report is available. It is purely a printing problem. It is exacting printing and not a light task for the Government Printer.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend at this stage to delay the passage of the Bill, but I understood from the Governor's Speech today that certain appropriations have to be dealt with this session. Does this concern appropriations of revenue for some departments in the year ending June 30 next? If so, can we expect the introduction of legislation to cover this matter, or is the amount we are now asked to approve sufficient to carry on the normal services of the State until we consider the Revenue Estimates? Irrespective of the contents of the Auditor-General's report, we

understood from the Governor's Speech that a fair amount of legislation is to be introduced. Will the Opposition have copies of the Bills available when the second reading explanations are given? If printed copies cannot be made available perhaps roneoed or typed copies could be supplied so as to prevent members from having to analyze the second reading explanations without having copies of the Bills. Does any appropriation from one Government department have to be transferred to another department? I do not want to interfere with the normal business requirements of the State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): Last year, before June 30 it was necessary to bring down Supplementary Estimates to cover expenditure in the year ending on that date. In other words, the Estimates passed were not sufficient to meet all the expenses incurred by the Government. That is not the position this year and the Government will not have to introduce Supplementary Estimates. Parliament has already provided the necessary authority for all expenditure up to June 30 next. This Bill will become effective on July 1 and has nothing to do with financial matters up to June 30 this year. I hope this explanation meets the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Yes, but there is still a doubt in my mind as to whether matters will have to be raised later and whether there have been transfers of appropriations from one department to another.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under the Audit Act it is not possible to transfer money from one department to another without its being voted in the Estimates.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I am thinking of that and I have in mind the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It cannot be done unless there has been a special appropriation by Parliament. The only item of any substance that is outside the Estimates passed last year is an amount of £1,000,000 made available to the Electricity Trust. This happened because a Bill was passed enabling the Government to do it. The appropriation of the £1,000,000 was approved by Parliament. No Supplementary Estimates are necessary this year. This is purely a Supply Bill to enable salaries to be paid and normal expenses to be met from the beginning of the new financial year. Members will be

particularly interested in one of the items concerned.

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

QUESTIONS.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: As a result of the recent Loan Council meeting, can the Treasurer state the amount of funds that will be made available for house building in this State, the proportion of such funds to be used for rental houses as against purchase houses, and whether there is to be any allocation of funds for the purchase of existing houses with reasonable equity under the State Bank administration?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The amounts of money made available for house building in South Australia come from a number of places. The Loan Council provides some of the funds, but other funds are provided through Government instrumentalities and repayments of previous loans. I regret to tell the Leader that at the present moment it would be impossible for me to give a complete answer to the question because, having now got approval for semi-governmental raisings, we have now to see if we can raise the amount approved. In round terms, the total amount made available last year under the various activities and Acts of Parliament of this State will be, I think, £24,600,000 by June 30, and I hope that the programme next year will be at least as large as that. Without that support, of course, the building industry in this State would be in a difficult position.

The number of rental houses depends, to a certain extent, upon the ability of the Housing Trust to sell houses. Obviously, it sells as many houses as it can because any deposit it can get on a house is additional money that it can use for further building. Generally, the Housing Trust's allocation of the money is about £6,100,000. I think that last year it had £6,165,000, or thereabouts. Usually, about half of its funds goes to rental houses and half to purchase houses. As soon as I can get some more factual information I will advise the Leader.

RAILWAY RESERVOIR RESERVES.

Mr. SHANNON: It has come to my notice that there is some talk—and it may be only talk—that the Railways Department may dispose of some of its small reservoir hills storages that it has used for many years for

railway purposes and now no longer requires because the Onkaparinga Valley scheme provides what small amount of water is now used by the railways. I have in mind the Amble-side, Mount Barker and Aldgate railway dams. I suggest to the Government that these be retained and used for purposes of tourism both by the local people and by visitors. Although I readily admit that it will mean some loss in capital accretions to the railways in this field, I believe that the ultimate good of the populace will be best served in these little areas as they will provide an amenity. Is it not desirable that they be retained by the State rather than that the railways cash in for one year by the sale of a small asset?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Two or three important matters arise from that question. At present the Government has a considerable number of reserves in various parts of the State. We find it difficult administratively to control and manage them economically. We are at the moment trying to come to some arrangement, where these reserves have been established, with the local authority on the spot to see if it can control and manage that type of place.

Mr. Shannon: Local government would come in there.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am just coming to that. I believe that these sites have a particular interest to the local people. I agree with the honourable member that it is probably desirable that they be retained for use by the local people. On this the Government has a policy that it has announced freely whereby it has provided many thousands of pounds. Where a local authority desires to establish some recreation reserve and after investigation it proves to be a project that can be supported, the Government is providing, and will in the future continue to provide, 50 per cent of the Land Board's valuation as a subsidy towards its acquisition. That does not necessarily apply only to the railways; it applies also to private land as well. If the honourable member's local governing authorities are interested in the matter, I will arrange for a Land Board valuation to be made of these particular reserves and negotiate with the Railways Department to have them taken over and made available at half the Land Board's valuation to the local authority concerned.

Mr. Shannon: Could you not make them available to local government? They are your property.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has had many requests with regard to reserves. Some of these requests have amounted to an acquisition of land up to £500,000 in value. Obviously, there has to be some hurdle to jump. I will have the matter investigated and advise the honourable member on it.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Mr. CASEY: In view of the serious injury suffered by a railway employee and a less serious injury caused to another employee operating in the Peterborough division of the South Australian Railways in the Mingary section, and also the serious damage that was caused to three locomotives which could have resulted in fatal injuries, will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, obtain a report from the Commissioner as to the causes of the accidents and what protective measures, if any, are to be taken to prevent any future occurrences?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. In the normal course of events the Commissioner would have made his investigation through his departmental officers into the circumstances mentioned by the honourable member. I shall ask my colleague the Minister of Railways to obtain a report from the Commissioner on the matters raised.

IRON ORE EXPORTS.

Mr. DUNNAGE: The stop press column of today's *News* reports that the Western Australian Minister of Mines claims that Western Australia has excellent prospects of a flourishing iron ore trade with Japan. The Japanese trade delegation was here a week or two ago and I understand it is coming back in a fortnight's time. Will the Premier make a general statement on the South Australian iron ore deposits, on their value, and whether the Japanese are likely to be interested in them? South Australia has vast quantities of low-grade ore, but has it any ore that the Japanese are interested in or likely to take from us?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commonwealth Government recently relaxed its long-standing ban on the exportation of iron ore and now exercises only a partial ban on that material. The ban has not been relaxed as far as our main iron ore-producing centres are concerned—the Middleback Range—and they are still under a complete export ban. Since the ban was lifted the Government investigated the iron ore export possibilities.

The export ban applied not only to Japan: it was a total ban. The ban was lifted to the extent that where new discoveries of iron ore were made a proportion of the new discoveries were allowed to be exported unless those discoveries were so small that they were not considered of any permanent economic value. In that case I understand the Commonwealth Minister allows the whole of the deposit to be exported.

The Government is having a survey made of likely areas and I assure honourable members that I believe there is a permanently assured large market for iron ore if it is available for export. The ore has to be of a fairly high grade to fall within the price limits that overseas firms are prepared to pay. Deposits either have to be initially of high-grade ore or of a type of ore that can be lifted in grade by mechanical or other means to bring it to a grade acceptable to overseas firms.

I believe that the Western Australian project is one of low-grade ore that has to be beneficiated to bring it to the acceptable grade. I believe the work of evolving a process for lifting the grade is being carried out now in our State laboratories. I assure the honourable member that there is an enormous market available if we can get within the grade and price. The Government will provide all material assistance possible to assist any enterprise in investigations, and it will also assist in any other way possible, such as the loading of vessels and other things.

SCHOOL FIRES.

Mr. TAPPING: Some months ago a spate of fires occurred in State schools and the Taperoo high school in my district was damaged to the extent of £28,000. The Taperoo high school council was worried about the safety of schools and suggested to the Education Department that burglar alarms should be installed at the school and possibly at other schools. At that stage the Minister of Education wisely called in the experts—the Commissioner of Police, the fire chief, and others—in an effort to determine some policy to overcome the problem. The Taperoo high school council is disturbed that nothing has been heard of its proposal. It has been argued that advertising the existence of a burglar alarm may be regarded as a warning or a deterrent to anyone who may think of setting fire to a school. I wish to express the concern of the

school council and ask the Minister of Education if he has any progress report on the matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I did receive a communication from the member for Semaphore embodying the recommendation of the Taperoo high school committee, and I referred that to Cabinet. However, at that time several members of Cabinet were interested in the various aspects of school fires. I know that the Treasurer was concerned from a Treasury point of view, the Chief Secretary from the police aspect and the Minister of Works from the point of view of the Public Buildings Department. As a result Cabinet decided to appoint a small unofficial committee of heads of relevant departments, the Commissioner of Police, the Director of Education, the Director of the Public Buildings Department and the Chief Fire Officer of the Fire Brigades Department to advise on what measures they considered necessary or desirable to prevent these fires and acts of vandalism and damage to our school properties. Cabinet received advice from this committee and some advice was put into effect almost immediately without any variation, other advice was acted on with variations, and other advice still is being considered by Cabinet. The suggestion referred to by the honourable member is one of a series of suggestions that have been made from time to time. I cannot take the matter any further at the moment, but I take this opportunity, now that it has been raised, of expressing my personal appreciation (and, I am sure, the appreciation of the Government and, in fact, of the whole of Parliament) of the magnificent services rendered by the Police Department and the Fire Brigade Department in quelling these fires at very short notice, thus minimizing the damage done to our schools. Let me clear up a popular misconception. Although these schools may be vested in the Minister of Education, they do not belong to him or to the Government, but to the people of South Australia, and I am deeply appreciative of the great interest and concern shown by many people in protecting their asset.

GERARD MISSION.

Mr. KING: As the people of the Upper Murray, and particularly the parents of children attending the Winkie school, are deeply concerned with the unsatisfactory conditions prevailing at the United Aborigines Mission at Gerard, can the Minister of Works say what action has been taken to rectify those condi-

tions, and can he report on any negotiations he may have had with the mission authorities?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Immediately the health problem was known to the Aborigines Department, contact was made with the health authorities who readily agreed to take prompt action to suppress the outbreak. A team of medical officers went immediately to the mission and commenced remedial treatment. Later other interests became involved. The mission authorities were seriously embarrassed by the outbreak, but everything that can be done to remedy the position has been done and is being done, and those measures will be continued until the health of the natives has been restored.

The Government has for some time been concerned about the mission, which has peculiar difficulties. It is located close to large centres of population and is subject to contact with all manner of people—sometimes undesirable. That seems to be unavoidable. I do not object to natives having contact with people. I most ardently desire that those contacts should be widened and enlarged to a point where assimilation and integration become more widespread. I do not want to be misunderstood on this point.

In order to relieve the mission of some of its problems the Government has offered to take over the control of the health, hygiene and discipline of the natives who live there, and to undertake a programme of development for that area if the mission is willing to agree to the proposition. The proposal is still under consideration by the mission authorities and, pending their decision, I think it would be in the interests of all parties if little comment were made. I do not want to embarrass the mission or to put undue pressure on it.

Mr. King: Was it the same offer as was made in 1958?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not clear as to what offer was made in 1958. The present offer was framed after careful discussion by the Aborigines Board with myself. It was discussed in my office with representatives of the Mission Council and was subsequently confirmed by me to them in writing. I am awaiting their decision thereon.

BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.

Mr. STOTT: Can the Minister of Works intimate when tenders will be called for the building of the bridge across the Murray River at Blanchetown? I understand some negotiations have taken place with a proposed tenderer and the Highways Department concerning the prestressed concrete section. Can

he say whether that method has proved satisfactory and when tenders will be called and the contractor commence operations?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will refer the matter to my colleague for precise information. I know that certain tenderers have discussed with the department what type of bridge should be built and I know that prestressed concrete is being considered, but I cannot give more precise information without reference to my colleague.

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: My question concerns an article published in the *Northern Review* of June 15 under the heading "Secrecy about Jamestown Silo Case", one paragraph of which stated:

For about 18 months the *Northern Review* has been aware of the basic argument of growers in this area why Jamestown should be given preference over Caltowie as a silo site, but this information had been given in confidence, and was not for publication until the case was made public.

Although that information was regarded as confidential, in the latter part of the article (and this is intimately connected with my question) the following appears:

In its report to the Government, the Public Works Standing Committee recommends: the establishment of port facilities at Port Pirie capable of handling grain produced within the Port Pirie division to cater for the normal type of bulk grain handling cargo vessel with a mean loaded draft of up to 25ft. 6in. This work is estimated to cost £318,500, a 1,000,000 bushel capacity concrete vertical silo and shore terminal facilities, estimated to cost £400,000. The committee proposes that the northern berth at Baltic wharf should be adapted for use by bulk grain ships.

For many months I, and other members, have endeavoured to obtain a copy of the Public Works Standing Committee's report but on each occasion have been told that it is not available and has not been published. As late as last Friday—the day after this paper was issued—I asked the Minister of Works if a copy were obtainable and he replied that it was not and that it would not be made public until it was laid on the Table in Parliament some time today. However, in this country paper we have read what it contains—information which is confidential. It is most embarrassing for a country member who treats information as confidential to have it circulated in his electorate by a country paper. Can the Minister of Works ascertain how this country paper obtained this information and made it public and, if not, will he

try to discover the source from which this paper received this confidential information?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the first instance Public Works Standing Committee reports are made to me as Minister of Works. Cabinet then sees them and, in the normal course of events, they are laid on the Table for members to peruse and are placed on members' files. I do not know that there is any cast-iron rigidity about that procedure. After all, the Public Works Committee is a committee appointed by Parliament to investigate certain proposals and, as such, is responsible to Parliament. However, the honourable member did inquire about a copy of this report and I indicated to him that, as Parliament was about to sit, it would be courtesy to Parliament to place it on the Table at the earliest sitting. The honourable member knows that the press is active in ascertaining information and is able, by virtue of piecing together information obtained from here and there, to get a fairly accurate picture of occurrences and trends. He said I had seen the press article, which purports to report verbatim certain extracts from the committee's report. I am at a loss to understand just how that may have been obtained, and I would not venture to conjecture how it was obtained.

Mr. Stott: The Premier made a broadcast on it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: But he did not quote the report of the Public Works Committee; he made certain broad statements about what was proposed. I do not think the press would disclose the source of its information if I asked it, so I do not think it is much use pursuing that question. I have not compared the press report with the actual wording of the committee's report to see if it is accurate or not, but I presume it is. In this case the press has obtained the information and I do not think any great harm has been done except that the honourable member, who was good enough to come to me and ask about it, has been denied the privilege of being the first to report it.

FRUIT CANNING COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. BYWATERS: Can the Premier say whether a report has been provided by the Fruit Canning Industry Committee set up by the Government two years ago? If he has received this report, does he intend to table it during this short session? If he has not received it, will he take steps to ascertain the position?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government received the report, I think four months ago, but does not intend to table it. Much information it contains, if made available, would embarrass certain industries, and much of it is confidential. Having examined the report in Cabinet, the Government concluded that it would not be fair to industries that had provided confidential information that was the basis of the report to find this information being made public.

Mr. BYWATERS: Could a revised part of the report be made available to members?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member, or any other member, has any firm which is interested in the report and which authorizes him to secure information concerning the recommendations regarding that firm or industry, or if, on the other hand, the honourable member will assure me that the information that I provide will be kept confidential, I shall certainly be prepared to supply it to him, or to any member, under those circumstances. However, I think the information, if made available, would be unfairly detrimental to certain people, and in those circumstances I do not think members would like to see it made public.

FILM ADVERTISING.

Mrs. STEELE: I have observed and, further, my attention has been drawn to undesirable features that are again appearing in the advertising of current films in recent days. Will the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, undertake to have this matter investigated with a view to eliminating this type of advertising?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will refer the question to the Chief Secretary and I am sure he will immediately get a police report on it. I will advise the honourable member in due course.

WHEAT EXPORTS.

Mr. QUIRKE: As everyone knows, huge quantities of wheat have been sold to Communist China. Although I make it clear that my question is not in any way a criticism, as I have every confidence in the Wheat Board and believe that, wheat being a food, it should go where it is needed, the thing that interests me is that although it is the farmer's wheat the farmer does not know how and when it is intended that it shall be paid for by Communist China. I do not want to know the price received for it, as I know that could be an embarrassment in international trade, but I

should like to know what are the proposals regarding payment by China for the wheat, which we know has been sold on a time-payment basis.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The terms upon which credit has been made available to China have been publicly announced. Although I have seen them on several occasions, I do not remember them, but I think 10 per cent is to be paid on delivery, 40 per cent in six months and the remainder in one year. I am not sure if that is the information the honourable member requires. I think the information he wants is how the payments are referred back to growers and the basis upon which they will be paid. Quite frankly, I have never seen that information outlined and, if it has not been made available to the Minister of Agriculture and it is not available, I shall write to the Federal authorities and see whether it can be obtained.

GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. LAUCKE: Will the Premier state whether the Government intends to continue the system of inquiry and recommendation by the Prices Commissioner in respect of the price of wine grapes for the next vintage?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Immediately after the last report of the Prices Commissioner, which was accepted by all sections of the industry, was made available, I received from a number of sources a request that the Prices Commissioner continue his work on fixing prices and give a recommendation for next year. As far as I know, every section of the industry considered that Mr. Murphy's determinations were fair and proper and a number of organizations—I think the Australian Primary Producers Union was one and the Grap growers Association another—have written to me asking whether he could be made available. If the industries desire it, the Government is willing that he continue the work he did last year, which I believe was considered all round to be most satisfactory.

RAILWAY STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. RICHES: Can the Premier make a statement concerning negotiations for the standardization of the railways in the northern parts of the State? Apart from all the desirable considerations and the urgency associated with this work, the unemployment position in South Australia at present, including that in those districts where lines are proposed to be standardized, is more urgent now than ever before. As far as I

know, we have had no clear statement from the Premier as to the stage negotiations have reached. Can he say what the position is?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Negotiations that have been carried on by this Government with the Commonwealth Government for a considerable time since work in the South-East was completed have broken down, and my Government has issued a writ in the High Court seeking a declaration of the rights of South Australia under the agreement entered into between the two authorities, I think in 1948. The South Australian Government has entered its pleas and the Commonwealth Government has presented its defence, and the case is set down for hearing early in October by the High Court in Sydney; so honourable members will see that this matter is actively before the court. Under those circumstances I think it would be improper for me to embark upon what might be regarded as something that is at present under consideration by the court.

Mr. Riches: Is any work going on at all?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Since the Government issued the writ, the Commonwealth did announce that it was considering priorities for Commonwealth assistance to a number of works which were considered to have high priorities from an export point of view. I do not remember all the works, but included were some roads in Queensland considered to be essential for the beef industry, coal loading facilities in New South Wales, standardization of the railways in South Australia, and a project for the standardization of the line from Kalgoorlie to Kwinana. None of these works has had any funds provided for it to date except that I think for the Queensland project a small sum has been agreed to, I believe about £600,000. There is no work going ahead at the moment for railway standardization, except the completion of work on the Melbourne to Albury line.

HIRE-PURCHASE LEGISLATION.

Mr. RYAN: The hire-purchase legislation passed by both Houses last session included a section providing for a minimum deposit. Each day in all newspapers appear advertisements in very large print stating that goods can be purchased without deposit and at so much a week, which is outside the ambit of the law. I should like to know whether any prosecutions are pending, and, if not, are prosecutions contemplated for misrepresentation of the law as it operates today?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I know that my colleague, the Attorney-General, has been giving this matter close attention and I will endeavour to get a considered reply from him, to be made available to the honourable member and the House tomorrow.

SPORTING IDENTITY'S ARREST.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Some short time ago a prominent sporting identity was arrested in my district and was conveyed to the City Watchhouse where a charge under the Lottery and Gaming Act was laid against her. That charge was withdrawn before the court the following morning. As this has not been an entirely isolated case in my own district, I have been very concerned about it. Will the Premier obtain from the Chief Secretary a full report of the circumstances under which this lady was arrested and the circumstances under which the charge against her was withdrawn?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know of none of the circumstances of this particular case except what I have read in the press. I will obtain a report from the Chief Secretary and discuss the matter with the honourable member, I suggest, confidentially. Let me say that I personally believe that in Miss Fraser we have a person of whom we in South Australia ought to be very proud. She has been under considerable criticism from outside South Australia, and I for one—and I know honourable members here feel the same—would not be in favour of disparaging in any way a young lady who has brought great fame to South Australia.

INSURANCE LIABILITY

Mr. LAWN: I received a letter this morning from a constituent who informed me that, in 1959, he was involved in a car accident and that recently proceedings had been taken against him in the Supreme Court for damages approximating £800. His car is insured, both for third party and comprehensive insurance, with the Standard Insurance Company which, I understand, is now before the Court on an application for the winding up of that company. This person has told me that he is unable to pay these damages himself. Other people who have their insurance with this company are probably in a similar position. Can the Premier indicate the position of people who have insured their motor cars with this company, and, if not, will he obtain a report from the Crown Law Office?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will get a full report on the matter and inform the honourable member.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, Messrs. King, Quirke, and Frank Walsh.

Library: The Speaker, Messrs. Clark, Nankivell, and Ryan.

Printing: Messrs. Bywaters, Hall, Harding, McKee, and Mrs. Steele.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Coumbe, King, Jenkins, Millhouse, and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening the Parliament, and to report on June 21.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Para Hills Water Supply and Sewerage Scheme,

Grand Junction Road and Port Road Trunk Water Main (From Hanson Road to Port Adelaide Railway Station),

Bridge to replace Jervois Bridge, Port Adelaide (progress),

Dover Gardens Girls Technical High School,

Nangwarry Sewerage Scheme, Adelaide Technical High School,

Glandore Remand Home, Port Pirie Bulk Handling Scheme,

South Australian School of Art,

Penola Water Supply.

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 21, at 2 p.m.