

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday, September 30, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS****HOUSING TRUST RENTS.**

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A statement in today's *Advertiser* concerning increases in Housing Trust rents appears to be somewhat at variance with another statement made by the Premier in this House. The press report of the Premier's statement is as follows:

The trust proposed many and varied increases, but gave him no indication of these proposals until after the Chairman (Mr. Cartledge) had released details to the press.

The Premier, at page 1511 of *Hansard*, is reported as saying:

I wish to make it known that the Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust a few weeks ago consulted me concerning the need to increase certain of the trust's rents.

As it seems difficult to reconcile those two statements, will the Premier clear the matter up?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Very often when a statement is taken out of its full context it may be given a different meaning. I think the Leader will find that *Hansard* records that I indicated I had had an interview with the Chairman of the Housing Trust concerning increases in rents. I admitted that, and I also admitted that I could have been at fault for not having asked for further information before the information was actually disclosed. The plain facts are that the Chairman did not give me any information regarding the actual increases. When questioned by the member for Torrens, I replied that I believed the increases (and I did not know what they were) might be justified. Apparently the member for Torrens knew more about this matter than I did, as I had not been informed at that stage of details of the rent increases. My previous statement in this House was correct, and I repeat it today: at no stage did the Chairman of the trust inform me of the details of the rent increases until this information had been made known to the press. After I had asked him for a statement I received one.

Mr. CUMBE: I have asked questions in the past two weeks seeking information on the rent increase, which was raised by me in the first place in this House. The Premier said on each occasion that he would inform me following a discussion between the Housing Trust members,

the trust's officers and himself. As late as yesterday I asked the following question:

Is the Premier able to reply to a question I asked last week about the adjustment of Housing Trust rentals following his conference with officers of the Housing Trust, or is he about to make an announcement on this matter?

The Premier replied:

I believe that I should be in a position to supply information on this matter tomorrow. In view of the Premier's announcement on television last night on this subject, did the Premier have in his possession when I asked the question yesterday the details he announced last night?

Mr. Lawn: It was following tradition.

Mr. CUMBE: Was he being ambiguous, or was he being deliberately discourteous to this House and to me by refusing to answer my question, fully knowing that he would be on television the same day?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I reply, the member for Torrens will be able to judge whether the reply I gave yesterday was accurate. I have not had the opportunity of reading anything which may have been published or which may have come over the air since this morning, but my minute to the Chairman of the Housing Trust states:

Further to previous discussion on this matter, I am prepared to accept increases only on the following conditions:

That decreases in rent proposed by the trust take place. All notices of increased rents on houses be withdrawn, except where the increase does not exceed 5s. a week. In all other cases rent increases not exceeding 5s. a week are to be effected. Concerning flats, where rents have been increased as from August 21, 1965, no further increases are to take place in 12 months' time as previously intended.

The minute from the Housing Trust in reply states:

The Housing Trust has considered the above minute at its meeting held this morning. The trust is of opinion that what was proposed by the trust as regards increases of rents was both justified and reasonable. However, under the circumstances the trust feels it must agree to the matters set out in the minute.

After receiving that, I received further information by minute (the contents of which I do not propose to disclose) from the housing Trust, signed by the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman, and the five other members of the trust. I received that last Friday. At about 4.30 p.m. yesterday the following minute was sent in reply to the General Manager of the Housing Trust:

I desire to inform you that I have given very serious consideration to the contents of the statement and I am unable to agree to the requests contained therein. I now reaffirm my minute—

and then I re-stated the points I have just mentioned, and in addition I stipulated that the 6,174 rentals mentioned where no alteration was effected remain unaffected. My minute continued:

The above will make the position quite clear that there are 1,908 cases where reductions will take place, no increase will be made in Housing Trust rents beyond 5s. a week, there will be no further increases in flat rents, and all notices for both rental homes and flats are to be withdrawn. Further, it is the intention of the Government to have a complete review of the whole of the matters associated with the Housing Trust, and an amendment to the Housing Trust Act to provide for the appointment of a Minister who will be responsible to Parliament.

The trust has not replied to that minute. I understand that the trust will probably meet next Tuesday. The minute that I read earlier would have been received by the trust some time after 4.30 p.m. yesterday. It was signed by me and it left this place by messenger. It was all completed after question time yesterday.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand the Premier's answer, he received the minute from the Housing Trust last Friday and sent a reply from the House late yesterday afternoon. His telecast appears, I think, some time around 7 o'clock in the evening, but I understand that that is taped (it is not a live telecast) some time during the morning. Am I right in that understanding? Will the Premier say whether, in fact, last night's telecast was taped some time before the House met yesterday afternoon?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: To put matters in their proper perspective, I point out that the first reply that I gave from the docket this afternoon was to the effect that Cabinet had considered rent increases. I also said that I received a further docket last Friday in respect of which a certain other docket was forwarded to the trust as late as yesterday. The telecast, "The Premier Speaks", is entirely a matter between Channel 7 and me.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I want to make sure that I understand what the Premier's announcement means. The Premier announced last evening that the Government had decided that certain Housing Trust rents should be increased by 5s. Part of the Premier's statement dealt not with the immediate problem but rather with

the problem ahead. The report in the *Advertiser* states:

The Labor Government was firm in its view that 10 years was too long a period for rent adjustment. Before the last war, Housing Trust rents were about 12s. 6d. a week, based on the basic wage. "If rents are to be related to the basic wage—and I sincerely hope they will be—who can predict the basic wage in 10 years or even five years?" the Premier said. "You will agree rents must be realistic."

Did the Premier state Government policy when he said, first, that in future rents should be based on the basic wage and, secondly, that rents should be increased more frequently than they have been in the past?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that something was left out of what I said.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Could the Premier make available the script of his speech on television?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Never mind the script. I repeat what I have said: 10-year periods are too long between rent reviews. In its administration the trust should have given more attention to making increases forthwith when various rates were increased. For instance, if council rates, water rates, land tax or other charges increased from time to time, the trust could have increased rents by, say, 6d. a week to allow for increased costs, and then the tenants would have been expected to pay the increased rents, provided they were not amongst the 1,000 people recognized by the trust (such as widows or those receiving invalid or old age pensions) who would suffer a particular hardship. I do not think any member in the House would want to alter that approach to Housing Trust rents. When a council in an area finds it necessary to increase its rating, this means that the Housing Trust has to pay more from its rental income (and this was always recognized under rent control), and tenants should pay increased rent where they can reasonably afford it. It has been a recognized practice that the basic wage can serve as a useful measuring rod in respect of rent, and I believe it was used in the calculation of rents of cottages years ago. We would be better off if superannuation benefits, insurance policies, and other matters were related to the basic wage. Therefore, I repeat that a 10-year review period is too long. An organization like the Housing Trust knows when increases take place and should allocate rental increases then.

Mr. Jennings: It was shielding the previous Government.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I did not suggest that, but this increase seems to have applied in reverse. If I wanted to be narrow in my view on this matter I could say that the increases were shelved until the last election, because it is strange that they should have been made immediately after the election. We have had to contend with enough as it is in meeting our responsibilities of expenditure in this State. I have nothing to withdraw from what I have said concerning rents. If the Government has no authority over the Housing Trust, then I believe that the tenants should be enabled to pay the increases as they are warranted, and that increases should not be left to multiply over 10 years.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Premier say whether any increases in rent were made by the Housing Trust over the past 10 years? I have at Angaston many constituents occupying the older type of trust house, and I have received a letter from one of those constituents protesting against the announced rent increase. He pointed out that only three or four years ago there was a rise of 10s. a week in the rent of some of the trust houses at Angaston, and he went on to say:

My salary has not doubled over these years, but the rent has more than doubled. Why? Have there been instances (as appears to be the case) where the rent has been increased within the last 10 years?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is almost 10 years since there has been a general increase. It is true that there have been increases in individual cases: for instance, where a tenant has moved out of a house. I think there have been about 6,000 such instances. In these circumstances the rents of the houses next door are left at the old rate, while the incoming tenant may pay 5s., 10s. or 15s. a week more.

Mr. Jennings: That has been going on for years and years.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If the honourable member gives me the particulars of increases that have taken place for any other reason than the reasons I have mentioned, I shall take the matter up with the Housing Trust.

#### CITRUS COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURREN: Some months ago a committee was appointed by the previous Government to inquire into the citrus industry in South Australia. Various rumours have circulated recently that the report of this committee will soon be available. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the report has been

completed and, if it has, when it will be tabled in Parliament?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: When I spoke to the chairman of the committee this morning, he assured me that the report was almost completed. It is a lengthy one, and when it is brought down I am sure that it will be received with much interest. I commend this committee for its great activity in making this inquiry. It has visited various parts of South Australia, has taken evidence in the Eastern States, and has gained valuable information. It has worked long hours on this inquiry because I requested that it present its report about this time. Both the chairman and members of the committee have worked overtime to submit the report to me so that any legislation required might be introduced this session. I cannot say when I shall be able to bring down the report, because I wish to read it first and to submit it to Cabinet for consideration. I assure the honourable member that the report should be available soon.

#### MORPHETT VALE SCHOOL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Education say what progress is being made to provide land for the new primary school at Morphett Vale; what is the target date of the opening of the new school that will be built on that land; and what is the eventual plan for the old primary school? Will the road-widening programme require land from the old schoolgrounds?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get that information for the honourable member.

#### LOCUSTS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 14 concerning the reported discovery of large beds of locusts in the western districts of New South Wales, which could assume plague proportions and extend into Victoria and possibly South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The report from British and Australian scientists concerning locust activity in south-west Queensland and north-west New South Wales is generally correct in content, but rather misleading in context, as it refers to long range conditions rather than to current situations. It is a summary of current investigations being carried out by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization in collaboration with the Departments of Agriculture of New South Wales, Victoria and

South Australia. The investigations were assisted by a three-month visit by Dr. R. C. Rainey, Mr. C. Ashall and Miss Z. Waloff of the Anti-Locust Research Council.

Regular surveys of the above areas were recommended by the Commonwealth and State Entomologists' Conference in 1963, and have been in progress since January, 1964. An intensive period of field study with the visiting overseas locust authorities was climaxed by a general locust conference in Canberra on March 26, 1965. At this conference it was concluded that there is now considerable evidence of large locust populations surviving at low densities in these arid regions, and that at times these populations give rise to vast swarm development capable of influencing locust outbreaks in South Australia and Victoria. The actual conditions leading to swarm development are still largely undetermined.

There is now good but largely circumstantial evidence to indicate that these arid regions play an important role in the changing distribution of locusts at the beginning of all outbreaks which affect South Australia and which invade Victoria. Direct evidence is still lacking, owing to the lack of sufficient and continued observation in these areas. It is now considered that continued observation of locust activity in these arid regions will not only provide direct evidence of an association between these areas and our locust outbreaks but at the same time reveal the mechanisms by which this association works. Large locust swarms have been observed in these areas during the period of survey, but so far these have all either dispersed or migrated away from South Australia and Victoria, and have been lost in the interior.

At present these areas are in the grip of severe drought and locust activity is very low, so that this does not constitute a threat to South Australia in the immediate future. A further survey will be undertaken from September 27, 1965, and at the appropriate time, when increasing locust activity is observed in the survey areas of New South Wales and Queensland, surveys of Northern South Australia will have to be undertaken.

#### PORT WAKEFIELD WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: Earlier this year I brought to the notice of the Engineering and Water Supply Department the need for improvement in the water supply to residents along the main

road south of Port Wakefield. The pressure in this general area last summer was insufficient to maintain a good supply. As another hot period will begin soon, will the Minister of Works examine this matter and obtain a report on low water pressures south of Port Wakefield?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will endeavour to have a report for the honourable member next week.

#### MENTALLY RETARDED.

Mr. McKEE: As the Minister of Education knows, a centre for the mentally retarded has almost been completed at Port Pirie and is expected to be opened early next year. Can the Minister say what amenities will be required in this centre and what amenities will be subject to Government subsidy?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to prepare a report on this matter for the honourable member.

#### CAMPBELLTOWN SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education say when the building of the Campbelltown Boys Technical High School is likely to begin, because I understand that, as a result of the pressure on accommodation at the Norwood Boys Technical High School and at the Campbelltown High School, a new school is urgently needed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

#### TEACHERS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On September 15, I asked the Minister of Education whether he had made a decision about the permanent employment of married women teachers within his department. He said that he hoped to make a statement in a week or so. As a fortnight has now passed since I asked my question, has the Minister further information?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This matter has yet to be finalized in the sense of its being approved executively and so on. However, the position will be this: under the previous arrangement there had to be a break of three days in the service of a woman teacher who married, which broke the continuity of her service; this will no longer be required so that a woman teacher who now marries will still retain her accrued sick leave and long service leave benefits, and will be able to continue her superannuation payments. She will be classified as a temporary officer instead of as a permanent officer. Although this will not mean that all avenues of promotion will be

unavailable, the avenues of promotion will not be quite as good as those open to a permanent teacher. This condition, of course, has always applied.

#### KALANGADOO CROSSING.

Mr. RODDA: At the Millicent Road crossing, Kalangadoo, a fatal accident occurred last month. Later this year a new primary school will be erected outside the town beyond this crossing. I understand that the District Council of Penola, which is the local government authority in the area, has examined this matter and has suggested the installation of flashing lights or some other warning device at this dangerous crossing. Will the Premier raise this matter with his colleague with a view to having a suitable warning device installed at the crossing?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be pleased to raise this matter with my colleague, and bring down a report as soon as possible.

#### ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My question relates to the possibility of employment for Aborigines in the north-western areas of the State. In my several travels through the North-West (and including the contiguous areas of the Northern Territory and Western Australia) I have observed possibilities there for mining ventures. Indeed, much research has been done in the area, and prospecting and various other forms of mineral survey have been carried out. One company did operate for a short time in the Blackstone Ranges in a nickel-mining venture which eventually folded up. It would seem that this area should be further examined not only for the purpose I have mentioned but for the general benefit of the State. I believe the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs will agree with me that, if a good open-cut mining venture could be established in that area, it would prove of immense benefit to each of the three Governments involved in Aboriginal matters in that area and would help keep the indigenous peoples in the area, which is their own home country. I am aware that the mineral surveys may not have extended far beyond the borders of South Australia. Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs take up this matter with the Minister of Mines to ascertain what investigations have been made by the Commonwealth Government in the Peterman Range and by the Western Australian Government in the Warburton Ranges (which areas are in their respective Aboriginal reserves) for the purpose of surveying carefully

the area for minerals? Also, will the Minister consult with the respective Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs on the same question, so that joint action may be taken by the two departments in a special way to see whether there are any possibilities of successful mining ventures in the areas in South Australia, Western Australia or the Northern Territory?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Much attention has been given by the department to the possibility of mining ventures in the North-West Reserve. However, it is the Government's policy that mining in this district should be reserved for Aborigines and should only take place with the consent of Aborigines on the reserve. If they are reluctant to having mining ventures there, then there shall be no mining ventures. We have had several approaches, not only in relation to general nickel development but also in relation to the purchase of semi-precious stones from the North-West Reserve. As the former Minister knows, there are beautiful semi-precious stones readily available in the reserve without much mining, and there have been several approaches to have Aborigines collect this material and to sell it to ventures that would treat, cut and polish the stones and export them. I have taken the view that this activity should be reserved to Aborigines. In consequence, I have asked the Minister of Mines to second from his department an officer, experienced both in prospecting work and in dealing with Aborigines (and I know he has such an officer), to train Aborigines on the North-West Reserve in the collection of semi-precious stones.

We are also investigating (and have approached two bodies that can assist us) the development of a semi-precious stone industry for this reserve, both as to the economics of the export of such products and also of the processing and training of Aborigines in cutting and polishing. Prospecting and surveys by the Mines Department for general mineral development continue in the North-West Reserve. We have already inquired about the position in the neighbouring areas of Western Australia and Northern Territory. Discoveries have been made in Western Australia of deposits which, combined with our own, could conceivably be economically workable. At present we are insistent, and shall continue to be, that any development there must be by the Aborigines, and nobody in the general community will be able to get a miner's right in the North-West Reserve. I assure the honourable member that these matters are constantly receiving attention, and we hope that

it will be possible, through the mineral development in the North-West, both on and off the reserve, to provide much extra employment for the Aborigines there.

#### WATER SUPPLIES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am concerned about the dry weather affecting water supplies. Can the Minister of Works say whether supplies at present are up to the level indicated by the appropriate formula? Has that formula which has been in use for some years and proved to be well founded, been altered?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I apologize for my statement yesterday that I had not received a reply for the Leader. I had received one but overlooked it. The Acting Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

There is no set formula that can be used to determine whether water storages are adequate for future needs. The supply available and the consumption are reviewed from day to day and from week to week in the light of intake into the reservoirs and the pumping is adjusted accordingly to ensure that the utmost economy in pumping costs is obtained along with a safe residual storage. Because of the low September rainfall, storage in the reservoirs began to fall ten days ago. There is now little chance of any natural replenishment, and the pumping rate in the Mannum-Adelaide main has been stepped up today from 160,000,000 to 275,000,000 gallons a week—the maximum off-peak capacity. It may be necessary to pump during the higher tariff on-peak periods later in the season, but this will depend upon consumption and will be avoided if possible. The metropolitan reservoirs now contain 16,400,000,000 gallons compared with their capacity of 23,821,000,000 gallons.

#### AXLE LOADINGS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of September 15 about axle loadings?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that in April of this year the Road Traffic Board recommended a maximum load of 5,000 lb. on any single tyre of a motor vehicle. This would mean a weight limit of approximately 4½ tons on the front axle of a vehicle or any other axle which is equipped with only two tyres. The proposed amendment would bring South Australian legislation on this matter in line with that of all other States. With regard to the weight limit on single rear axles fitted with four tyres, all Australian States impose a limit of either 8 tons or 8.03 tons (18,000 lb). In the case of dual rear

axles each fitted with four tyres, however, the weight limit in all States except South Australia is about 13 tons. In South Australia 16 tons may be carried on such axles. No variation in rear axle load limits has been considered as yet.

#### CROPS.

Mr. QUIRKE: In view of the continued long dry spell that we are experiencing, will the Minister of Agriculture say whether he has received any reports from agricultural advisers as to the conditions of crops in South Australia generally?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Personally, I have not received any reports, and I can only give a general answer to the honourable member's question. Much concern is being expressed about the long dry spell. This naturally concerns not only me but all those associated with the land, and, indeed, the whole of the State, because we rely so heavily on the man on the land. I hope that we shall have rain soon, so that both cereal crops and pastures will recover from their present condition.

#### TAILEM BEND WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yesterday I had a discussion with the Minister of Works concerning a certain case at Cooke Plains where an application had been made to have a water connection to the present Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme. I asked the Minister to ascertain whether that application had been replied to. As he has informed me that a reply has been sent, will he now give the context of that reply to the House?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: First, I thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this matter. I have found from the file that a letter addressed to the person concerned (whom I shall not name) was sent out on September 27, over the signature of Mr. Murrell (Assistant Director and Engineer of Operations). The letter states:

With reference to your letter dated August 23, 1965, the pumps used to supply water to the Tailem Bend-Keith trunk main for construction purposes do not have sufficient capacity to enable supplies to be given to landholders. It will be some time before the permanent pumping station is constructed from the trunk main, but to enable landholders for a certain distance from Tailem Bend to be supplied, it is proposed to connect the Tailem Bend-Keith trunk main to the existing elevated tank at Tailem Bend. A connecting main for this purpose is now being laid, but it is not anticipated that it will be completed until early in 1966, when consideration could be given to granting you a service.

## GRAPES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Considerable anxiety is being experienced, even at this stage, among some viticulturists in this State, who fear that large quantities of their grapes may not be marketed during the forthcoming vintage. Indeed, one grower who marketed a considerable quantity of grapes at the last vintage was informed earlier this year by the winery which had been taking his grapes for many years that it could not purchase any of his grapes during the 1966 vintage. The Royal Commission that was appointed some months ago has been taking evidence on this matter, but I do not know whether it has completed its findings. Will the Premier indicate whether its findings are likely to be made known shortly? In any case, will he indicate whether action will be taken without delay in having grape prices fixed for the forthcoming vintage, so that growers will know whether they will be able to find a market for their grapes?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have had discussions with the Chairman of the Royal Commission, but he has informed me only that the Commission is still visiting certain areas and making inspections. In other words, the Commission has not yet completed its investigations. I do not intend to intervene in respect of prices at this stage. I hope the Royal Commission's report will be presented soon so that I can make its findings known to Parliament. However, I do not think the Government of this State at any time should be responsible for continuing to finance the grapegrowing industry. In this field, most of the revenue obtained goes to the Commonwealth Government (and in this I include revenue derived from the last increase in the price of brandy), and I think it is up to the Commonwealth Government to decide whether this industry should receive further subsidies.

## HANSBOROUGH WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: During the debate on the Loan Estimates the Treasurer was good enough to indicate that a small group of farmers in the Hansborough area would be served with reticulated water during this year. Will the Minister of Works ascertain when that work will be commenced?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall endeavour to obtain a report for the honourable member.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. CORCORAN.

Mr. JENNINGS moved:

That a further month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Millicent (Mr. J. D. Corcoran) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

## FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act, 1958.

Motion carried.

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

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE:  
HUNDRED OF PENOLA.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Lands): I move:

That the travelling stock reserve adjoining section 535, hundred of Penola, shown on the plan laid before Parliament on June 10, 1964, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1960, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown Lands.

The stock reserve in question comprises 44½ acres, and was reserved in 1881 for the use of teamsters and persons travelling with stock. With modern methods of transport the need for this area has largely disappeared, and it is proposed that a small area of three acres out of this reserve be retained for this purpose. The Pastoral Board considers that the time is opportune to resume the major portion of the reserve, that is, 41½ acres, so that the land may be leased to the holder of the adjacent land. The question has been referred to the District Council of Penola and to the Stockowners' Association, and both bodies support the proposal for resumption. In view of these circumstances I ask members to support the motion.

Motion carried.

## THE ESTIMATES.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Before the House goes into Committee of Supply there is one matter which I desire to raise. Arising

out of the answer given by the Premier yesterday to the honourable member for Torrens, it concerns the telecast he made last night—

Mr. Jennings: You don't like it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not like the matter I am going to complain of; I do not like it at all, and I do not think other members like it. I raise this matter as a result also of the answers the Premier has seen fit to give in the House this afternoon. My contention is that the Premier's action in this matter was a calculated affront to members of this House. Yesterday, in answer to the member for Torrens, the Premier said:

I believe that I should be in a position to supply information on this matter tomorrow. The question that the member for Torrens had asked was:

Is the Premier able to reply to a question I asked yesterday about the adjustment of Housing Trust rentals, following his conference with officers of the trust, or is he about to make an announcement on this matter?

I contend that the Premier was able to reply to both parts of that question in the House yesterday afternoon. Today, I asked the Premier whether or not his telecast yesterday was taped before the House met yesterday, and I believe (and my belief is strengthened by the evasive answer he gave) that it was and that, in fact, when this House met yesterday afternoon the Premier was already in possession of all the facts that were required to answer the question by the member for Torrens, because he had already used them to tape his telecast. The Premier thought he was being pretty smart with the brush-off he gave me in question time this afternoon, but the fact that he refused to answer is, I believe, proof positive of my suggestion that the telecast had already been taped. Therefore, he was already in full possession of all the facts, but refused yesterday afternoon to give them in the House, whereas I believe that this House is the place where such information should be given.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That's the best we've heard for a long time.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The honourable member didn't protest last year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently the Minister of Education and the hyenas sitting behind him do not value highly the prerogatives of this House, or they would not be so loud in their laughter.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: We know the treatment we got in past years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that this House is the place in which information should be given, and I believe that it is certainly

the place in which it should be given if it is deliberately sought. It was deliberately sought by the member for Torrens yesterday.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It is a pity you didn't say that years ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall come to that interjection in a minute.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Don't get off the previous subject.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not going to do that: I shall come to it in another way.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You think an announcement should be made here before the Housing Trust is informed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General, the leading legal luminary, the Government's legal adviser, asks me a question. The Premier had already taped the answer and that information some hours before the Housing Trust was informed. I can see little difference—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was not publicly given.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —between doing that, and giving the answer in the place in which it should be given, that is, in this House. If, in fact, this is an insuperable obstacle (and I do not believe this), the information should have been delayed and given in this House today, after the Housing Trust was informed. The affront is to this House. The information was deliberately withheld from a member of this House who asked for it (and therefore from all members) so that it could be given by the Premier outside the House. Members of the Government Party have been quick to remind me, by way of laughter and interjection, of similar complaints which they made in past sessions. I do not believe that the present Leader of the Opposition, when he was Premier, ever deliberately refused to give information when it was asked of him in this House. I do not believe that ever happened.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: He used to tell us to watch and find out that evening.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The present Premier did not say, "Watch tonight and you'll get the answer." He said something untrue: that it would be today before he would be able to answer the question. That is all he said: he did not refer to anything else. I do not believe that the present Leader of the Opposition ever did that. I say deliberately that, if he did, I think he was in grievous error. I will not for a moment take refuge—as members opposite think I should—in the statement that because my Leader does something



it is automatically right. That is nonsense, and no member should take such a stand. I do not believe the Leader acted as has been alleged; if he did, it would have been equally as wrong for him as it was for the present Premier to have acted that way. I am surprised at members opposite, and the member for Adelaide started it when he interjected during question time that the present Premier was following tradition. I believe he interjected wrongly. I am surprised that members opposite should suggest that their Leader should take refuge in such a justification (after the complaints they made and have made in the past), when their Leader goes much further than the previous Premier ever did go in this matter. I am surprised that they should try to justify his action by referring to past actions by the present Leader, about which they were loud in their complaints. This is an important matter for this House. Too often Parliament is passed over, and here it was not only passed over in the sense the information was given outside, but it was passed over and there was a deliberate refusal to give the information that was sought in this place. That is an extremely bad thing and something that should not happen. I hope—and I can see the Premier is muttering to himself, but I cannot hear what he is saying, which is probably a good thing—

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It should not be tolerated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier has never said a truer word. If he is going on in this way he should not be tolerated, and no member on either side of the House should tolerate—

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I take exception to the words, "he should not be tolerated," and ask they be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: No, I think that is a fair comment. Honourable members should refrain from personalities both when interjecting and speaking.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir, for upholding me.

Mr. McKee: Don't get carried away.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought I was repeating what the Premier had said himself.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I did not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall defer to you, Sir. This whole thing was an extremely poor show. I hope in the interests of all members that there is no repetition of it. If there is, I shall repeat my complaint about it, but I hope that will not be necessary.

Mr. COURCE (Torrens): I support the remarks of the member for Mitcham. When I brought this matter up earlier today, I was at pains to set out the position clearly and asked a courteous question of the Premier. In his reply he was most adroit in not giving me a direct answer. I shall repeat my question so that there will be no mistake as to what was said. After the preamble to my question, I asked:

In view of the Premier's announcement on television last night on this subject, did the Premier have in his possession when I asked the question yesterday the details he announced last night?

Subsequent questioning and comments have revealed that the Premier must have had this information in his possession yesterday, and that he could have given this answer to my question at the time I asked it. I then went on to say:

Was he being ambiguous, or was he being deliberately discourteous to this House and to me by refusing to answer my question, fully knowing that he would be on television later the same day.

What is happening now indicates that the Premier had the information in his possession yesterday, that he could have answered my question, and that he was being discourteous not so much to me but to members of this House in refusing to answer the question. I think it is extremely discourteous and bad practice that a member should be refused the information he requires, and that he has to wait for the television, radio or the press to announce the details he seeks. I point out that a member of this House is seeking information as a member representing his constituents.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): As recently as yesterday I had reason to accuse the member for Torrens of being politically hypocritical and of talking cant and humbug. I now have even more reason to say that. I assure the member for Mitcham, too, that I have never heard such hypocrisy from him as I heard on this occasion. The reason for what is going on on the other side of the House today is clearly that members opposite are sorry because this Government has stood up to a bureaucratic organization which was set up by them and which for years was their tool and servant for political purposes.

Mr. Millhouse: Absolute nonsense!

Mr. Lawn: You wait and see what's coming!

Mr. JENNINGS: What happened yesterday has been made perfectly clear by the Premier. He said that the docket he quoted was sent to the Housing Trust after 4.30

yesterday. I shall now quote from *Hansard* of September 4, 1963, at page 836, where I asked a question, headed "Gepps Cross Hostel." The report states:

Very early in the session I asked the Premier a question regarding the future of the Gepps Cross migrant hostel, and in explanation of my question then I pointed out that in a debate last year both he and I had agreed that the type of accommodation afforded there was not the type of accommodation that should be regarded as suitable in this State. In answer to my question the Premier said he was having the matter investigated and he told me subsequently that, as the Commonwealth Government was implicated very much in this matter, he was discussing it with the Prime Minister, and, after he had been in Canberra recently, he told me that he had discussed it with the Prime Minister and was awaiting his reply. As this is my last opportunity to ask the Premier this question before the House adjourns for a short recess, I now ask him whether he has any reply from the Prime Minister on this matter.

I have asked three questions on this at three widely varying times. I admit, frankly, that I knew about a leak, and I knew that the then Premier was going to make his telecast on the subject that afternoon. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. Ryan: He had made the telecast in the morning.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course he had! This was the answer given by the then Premier:

I have now been able to reach agreement with the Commonwealth Government, and I can inform the honourable member that there has been an agreement arranged which will give him everything he desired.

The then Premier gave me no details or information about it whatsoever.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the honourable member be obliged to quote that answer correctly, and not misquote it, as he just has.

Mr. JENNINGS: I shall read the then Premier's answer.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course, there is not. That was the answer given on that occasion. I certainly did not watch the then Premier on television, because I had a horror of that session, but I certainly read about it on the front page of the *Advertiser* next day. I also vividly remember an occasion when the member for Port Adelaide asked a question but was refused the information sought, by the then Premier. I think that, if not on the same night, it came out on the television shortly afterwards. This sort of thing has been going on for years. When the member for

Mitcham talks so sanctimoniously about treating this House, the public, members of political Parties and important people in the community with contempt, let me say, now that we are talking about these 5AD sessions that used to be broadcast (and later the ADS7 sessions), that once, when I was a member of a deputation to the then Premier in regard to temporary Housing Trust houses, we argued this matter out in the then Premier's room for a long time. The then Premier said, "I will consider this matter, gentlemen, and then give you my decision later. Of course, I will have to refer it to Cabinet." That was the joke of the year—that the then Premier should refer anything to Cabinet. At the end of the deputation the then Premier's Secretary came in to say in front of us (and he obviously did not expect us to know what was going on), "You are wanted at ADS7, Sir." (It could have been 5AD in those days). The then Premier picked something up from his desk. He was very polite and shook hands, and went out then to make the broadcast. We read about it the next day in the *Advertiser*, and it transpired that the then Premier had had the information we sought already prepared and on his desk while we were in his room, but he was not prepared to disclose it to us. I think the real reason for this debate today is merely that members of the Opposition are politically hurt at what the Premier (and the Leader of the Government) has done to rectify the vicious increases in rents made by the Housing Trust.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): My name seems to have been bandied about a little in this debate, but I think I can claim to have some experience of administration where the Government is concerned. I am not sure that I can completely agree with all the remarks made by my two colleagues. I believe that a Government has certain rights in the issuing of information. It has a discretion as to when and where it makes its news releases. This is the position overseas. The President of the United States of America makes 90 per cent of his important statements away from Congress. However, I entirely support my colleagues in their complaint. If the Premier did not want to release information to the honourable member for Torrens yesterday then all he had to do was to say, "I intend to make a public statement upon the matter tonight." However, he did not do that: he said that he could not make a statement. When asked a question today, he attempted to cover up, and

I think that is a deplorable attitude to be adopted by the Leader of the Government.

Mr. Coumbe: He evaded the question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I intended to raise this matter on the motion to go into Committee, and to deal with the telecast itself. Although the Premier said there was no contradiction between his remarks in the telecast and those in reply to a question in the House, there is every sign of a contradiction. I do not know whether the Premier understands the meaning of words. On television, he is reported to have said:

The trust proposed many and varied increases but gave me no indication.

However, *Hansard* shows the Premier as having said that the Chairman of the Housing Trust had come to him and told him that there were to be increases. When I asked the Premier for the details he was forced to admit frankly that he had not troubled to ask for them. He said:

The only regrettable feature of this matter is the aspect of my responsibility to know what is being considered by the trust. I believe that details should have been shown to me before the announcement was made, and I am perturbed about that aspect. I do not think it was any person's fault. It could have been mine for not asking questions of the trust as to how soon the details would be ready.

How does that compare with the statement made last night as it is reported in the *Advertiser*? Today the Premier is reported as having said:

I think you will agree that it would have been reasonable for him to have informed me first.

That indicates that no information was supplied to the Premier. The facts are that the Chairman of the Housing Trust followed the conditions that he followed previously when Housing Trust rents were increased: he approached the Premier. I do not have the slightest doubt about that because the Premier said so in the House. When I was Premier and asked for details from the trust they were always supplied and did not contain any ambiguity whatever. In this case things went wrong because, when the question was first asked of the Premier, he did not take the trouble to have the details supplied to him.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They should have been supplied to him by the trust.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: By Act of Parliament the trust has certain responsibilities. My knowledge of the trust over a period of years has shown that it not only carried out its responsibilities under the Act: it has done its utmost to keep the Government

fully informed of its intentions. The Premier has said that he did not ask for details. If he was so unconcerned that he did not ask for details, how can he charge the trust with not supplying them? Those are the facts of the matter.

I do not complain and I have never complained about a Minister's making his statements when and where he believes it to be necessary. Certain statements must be made in the House as provided by Statute. It would be reprehensible for a Treasurer to give Budget details to the press or to the public before they were presented to Parliament. However, I make no complaint about the Premier's seeing fit to put this matter to the public directly. I believe this matter was not put to the public correctly because, when the Premier said that the Chairman of the trust had given him no indication, that meant that this matter had not been raised at all, whereas *Hansard* shows quite conclusively that the matter had been raised.

Mr. Shannon: We were told there was justification for some increase.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Having examined the matter, the Government has decided that house rents should be increased. I believe that an independent Housing Trust is the best body to deal with housing. Perhaps the Government is trying to prepare the Opposition for the introduction of a Bill to create a Minister of Housing. Speaking personally and not for my Party, I say that, if the Government wants to take the responsibility of fixing house rents, I know of nothing that will get it out of office as quickly, so I will help it along. If the Government takes this action, then every increase in rents will become a political matter.

Over the years the Labor Party has clearly stated that it intends to establish a Minister of Housing, and there could not be a Minister of Housing in this State who was not responsible for the Housing Trust. I believe the Government will find it has started to feed red meat to a young tiger by appointing a Minister of Housing. Other States have found this type of thing an embarrassment because rents have to be adjusted from time to time.

Mr. Curren: More frequently than every 10 years, though.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will give the policy of my Government—

Mr. Jennings: You haven't got a Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We protected the tenants of the Housing Trust

from any undue increases of rent. We maintained that the trust was an authority set up not to make profits but to provide houses at the cheapest possible rent that could be provided, and during the period of office of my Government that was done.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I rise to defend the Premier and to support the Government's decision in this matter. Before dealing with the Leader's incomplete quote from *Hansard* of the Premier's remarks, I should like to deal first with the incorrect statement he made about the United States Congress. He seems to forget that the United States President and all other members of the United States Executive are not even members of the Congress. However, that is beside the point. The Premier, in this House, on September 15, had this to say:

The only regrettable feature of this matter is the aspect of my responsibility to know what is being considered by the trust. I believe that details should have been shown to me before the announcement was made, and I am perturbed about this aspect. I do not think it was any person's fault. It could have been mine for not asking questions of the trust as to how soon the details would be ready. However, I expected that I would be informed before the increases were made public.

The Premier made it clear on that occasion that he expected to be informed of the details before any announcement was made public, and he was not informed. That is what he complained about yesterday in his telecast: that he had not been given any indication of the details of the proposed increases. It is no good the Leader's trying to put his own interpretation on the words of the Premier, trying to make them mean something else, and trying to make the Premier sound as though he were contradicting a previous statement: that is simply not the case. The Premier indicated (and it is clear in his answer to the question today and in his previous statements) that he knew something was under consideration, but that, when the trust made available to the press the details of the increases and when the notices had been sent out by the trust to the tenants, he had not been informed of the details, and that he was not informed of the details until the following day.

That is the complaint the Premier had. He indicated in the previous debate that perhaps it was his fault in the sense that he should have asked, but he also said that he expected to be informed of the details

before any announcement was made. What could be clearer than that? Surely any Premier in this position would have expected to be informed of the details. The fact that he was not informed gave rise to his complaint, and I consider that it was fully justified. Finally, I should like to say that for the Leader of the Opposition to get up this afternoon and complain about the form of the Premier's reply yesterday must rank as the biggest joke of the year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): The only explanation the member for Glenelg did not give us concerned what he thought was the biggest joke of the year.

Mr. Hudson: Didn't the honourable member listen to what I was saying?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is so easy to say that something is the biggest joke of the year, but the honourable member forgot to indicate his complaint. Having just spent five minutes on his feet, he is now presumably trying to make another speech. I have noticed before that he is a little thin-skinned about interjections when he is speaking, although he is happy to go on making speeches from his seat. The other day he rather lost his balance and objected simply because one member made a few interjections while he (the member for Glenelg) was speaking. On the other hand, he has been serving up interjections during the whole of the session. His allusion to "the biggest joke of the year" without explaining what it means is, to my mind, a rather weak way of finishing his speech. I suggest that, if he wants to make a point in this House, he would be well advised to make it emphatically and explain what he is talking about, otherwise he will not be very persuasive in a discussion of this kind. I have a couple of complaints to make about some of the comments that have been made from the Government bench today on this matter. I fully support what other members on this side said, namely, that they should be given a correct answer to a question. The member for Torrens was not given a correct answer to his question on Housing Trust rents.

Mr. Curren: Do you disagree with your Leader on that?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Chaffey is making a disturbance. Honourable members opposite are much happier when giggling, laughing, and interjecting from their seats than they are when on their feet, justifying their stand. Nobody is more notable in that respect than is the member for Chaffey, who I do not think has made a speech for the

last few months; if he has, I cannot remember what he said.

We on this side will probably soon be charged with wasting the time of the House, and the member for Port Pirie will be one who will add to the cheers when somebody makes that charge. We may even be told that we are filibustering. However, honourable members cannot have it every way. If they want to hear a debate they should listen to the debate and not interrupt, and if they want to have a party and interject, that is all right; but the debate does not progress any further. The most peculiar thing about all this is that when the matter was raised some Government members dived straight to the shelves for *Hansard*. The member for Port Adelaide has been searching for the last 20 minutes, and we may or may not know later whether he found something worth quoting. The member for Enfield quoted from *Hansard*, and I was able to follow his quotation. All I can say is that his reference is a most damning condemnation of his own lack of perspicacity. He asked a question and received a truthful answer, and, if he had the perspicacity which he now claims to have, he would possibly have been able to follow that question, and could have got more information if he wished. The *Hansard* report of the honourable member's question and of the reply states:

As this is my last opportunity to ask the Premier this question before the House adjourns for a short recess, I now ask him whether he has any reply from the Prime Minister on this matter.

THE HON. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have now been able to reach agreement with the Commonwealth Government and I can inform the honourable member that the agreement will give him everything he desires.

That was a perfectly truthful answer to a question. If the honourable member complained about that he certainly did not make it clear. I do not object to statements by leaders of the Government being made on television. It is a normal practice, and I see nothing wrong with it. The objection is that members do not get correct answers to their questions, and that is the kernel of this debate. Parliament is not being treated properly. Statements can be made on television whether or not the House is sitting, and I am happy to see that done. However, that is not what members opposite believe, although that is what their Leader is doing. The member for Port Adelaide once said:

A question can be asked in Parliament on Wednesday afternoon and the reply can be obtained from the television programme on

Wednesday night. That illustrates the contempt with which the Premier treats Parliament.

That fits this situation exactly, but it did not fit the situation about which the honourable member was speaking at that time. That statement appeared in 1963 *Hansard* at page 1052, and I emphasize the last line of the quotation. Apparently that was the honourable member's view then. I have never complained if the Premier wishes to make a statement on television, but I do complain when we do not get correct answers to questions.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): It is amazing to me to hear this matter brought forward, in view of the experience we had over the years as the Opposition Party in trying to get information from the then Premier. On many occasions I was unable to get any sort of answer from the then Premier, except of the most evasive character. Often I sat down feeling that it was a waste of time to try to get a straight answer from the Premier on a matter on which I wanted a straight answer. This statement from the Opposition is one of the most amazing and hypocritical I have heard.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying that to justify what the Premier did?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am pleased to hear that the Leader will support the Government in bringing the Housing Trust under Ministerial control. Only two weeks before the Housing Trust announced the increased rents, the Premier, on television, outlined the valuable services the trust had given to this State. It seems wrong that the trust did not think it sufficiently important to bring to the Premier the important details of these increases. It was its responsibility to let the Premier have these details, particularly as the trust officials are people who are politically conscious. No-one can say that they are not. The political repercussions of what was done must have been fully understood, particularly as arrangements concerning the proposed increases must have been considered and discussed for weeks before the announcement. However, the Premier was not given details, and the discussion today is only an effort to cloud the issue. One would think from the attitude of the Opposition that it was sorry that the rents were to be brought back to something like a reasonable figure. Opposition members should congratulate the Government in having done something about this savage increase. No-one with experience of councils would have the temerity to suggest

that council rates should be increased in this manner; they should be increased gradually and not in one fell swoop. Everyone knows that people have commitments over long periods in these days of time-payment and to have savage increases imposed in this manner is unrealistic. The people who were about to make the increases are politically conscious people and, because of the significance of the proposed increases, there is every reason why the Premier should have been approached and told of every detail. Apparently, it was not politic during 10 years to make general increases, but when a new Government came into office it was politic.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I defend the Premier, and I believe the public should be told the truth. This increase of rents, a political stunt connived at by Opposition members and officials of the Housing Trust, was considered the ace card to discredit the Government. Opposition members are bitter today because the situation back-fired.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: When do you think the Opposition and the Housing Trust officials connived at the increase?

Mr. McKEE: Prior to the election. There was no increase for many years but, when the Government of the day was defeated, it was considered proper to increase the rents. I claim it was a political stunt to discredit the Australian Labor Party. Recently I conferred with officers of the trust and was given information contrary to that given to the local press. I should have made that known earlier, as often I have been unable to obtain correct information from the trust. I doubt whether there is a Housing Trust house in the district of the member for Mitcham. He was put up as one of the Opposition's crumbling legal advisers in an endeavour to bring discredit on the Government. To my great pleasure, his effort has back-fired on the Opposition.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): The member for Port Pirie and, to a lesser extent, the Minister of Education have suggested that this is a political stunt and an attempt by the Opposition and the Housing Trust to embarrass the new Government.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I did not say that.

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister did say, though, that the increases were not in keeping with the Labor Party's policy, and that his Party's policy would not be in favour of such savage increases. The Minister had forgotten, of course, that the Government had

already agreed to a 50 per cent increase for some bus passengers, and he had conveniently forgotten also that his Government had agreed to a steep increase in water and sewerage rates. I do not know whether the same people who pay Housing Trust rents would be affected by those increased charges, but I think they would be. If it is a matter of Labor Party policy not to increase such charges, I suggest to the Minister that he think about what he has said.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It would be a good idea to adhere to the one subject!

Mr. SHANNON: I think most honourable members are now realizing that the Labor Party's election promises have to be financed, and that all sorts of people will have to foot the Bill.

Mr. Ryan: Not the Housing Trust!

Mr. SHANNON: I deplore certain things that have been said about the Housing Trust, and I am certain they are not justified. I am certain, too, from what the Premier himself said in the House on September 14, that many of the words spoken will be eaten. It would indeed be a good idea to call the Chairman of the trust to the bar of the House to tell members just what happened. If the Government has any doubt about what the Premier said, I shall quote his reply to the member for Torrens on September 14. He said:

I have released no information on this matter. I have no doubt that I would be able to justify any increases, but whether my reasoning would be acceptable to the honourable member and to other members of his Party, I am not sure. However, I will obtain a report and give the fullest information possible to the House as soon as it is available to me.

Only one interpretation can be placed on the words, "I have no doubt that I would be able to justify any increase." I believe that that reply caused a bit of a flurry at the time, and that certain pertinent questions were asked. The Government must have decided that the matter should not rest there and that it should do something about it, but all it has done is to try to cover up the matter ever since September 14, because the Premier dropped a bomb—such a bomb that members of the Government nearly fainted. This matter has reached rather serious proportions, because the veracity of a man in charge of an important undertaking (to wit, the Housing Trust) has been challenged. I am certain that sufficiently full details had previously been imparted to the Premier for him to say what he did, and that for members of the Government to say that the trust has not acted in good faith in

this matter is nothing more than a cover-up for an obvious *faux pas* by the Premier on that occasion. I am afraid the Premier is under pressure. I admire him greatly, and he knows that. I have never doubted his honesty; nor do I doubt it now.

However, I know that he is under great pressure, if not in this Chamber then elsewhere, where certain forces may be at work that we do not see here. I now plead with the Premier at least to clear the good names of the Chairman, the General Manager, and other members of the Housing Trust, some of whom I know well, and one of whom should be well known to every member of the Government benches, because he represents the Labor Party on the trust. That officer would be well able to inform the Government of anything it wished to know about the trust, because he represents the Labor Party's interests.

Mr. Ryan: He is only one of five, though.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, but he hears all that goes on. Does the Government deny that the Housing Trust acted in good faith in this matter? Why is it claimed that the trust did not warn the Government about these increases, when obviously it did? Cannot Government members understand what their own Leader said? It all appears to me to be a matter of blind faith, but the air will be properly cleared only if the Chairman of the trust and his able General Manager are exonerated from charges of doing something of which I know they could not be guilty. Indeed, from what I have heard in this Chamber, I am confident they are not guilty of those charges.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): Certain Opposition members have chided me and so I will speak in this debate. There is no element of doubt about what the result of the debate will be. I do not need to defend the Premier, because what he has done is absolutely correct. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Torrens would have been two of the first members to have risen if the Premier had made a release to the House before sending it to the Housing Trust. Between 2 and 3 o'clock yesterday the member for Torrens asked the Premier to give information about negotiations with the trust. The Premier said that he would be able to divulge that information this morning. Today the Premier explained the action he took. He said that at 4.40 p.m. yesterday a minute from him was delivered to the Housing Trust.

According to the Opposition, the Government has not done anything right since it has been in office. Let members opposite ask the people whether the Government's action in connection with Housing Trust rents has been right. Few members opposite are concerned about the increase, but many members on this side are greatly concerned, as are the constituents they represent. The Premier acted as any Premier should have acted in these circumstances. He sent a minute to the Housing Trust before anyone else received the information about this matter. The telecast was not made until 6.55 p.m. and by that time the General Manager of the Housing Trust had seen the minute.

Mr. Jennings: That is different from what happened in the other case.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. I was associated with the member for Enfield in the case to which he has referred. On that occasion the ex-Premier refused to supply us with information and then made an announcement on television that evening. No criticism was made by Liberal members on that occasion. The member for Alexandra has accused me of not substantiating claims I make. If he read *Hansard* he would see that, in the speech to which he referred, I referred to the Maintenance Bill which was before the House. The then Premier made an announcement on television on that occasion about a matter that was still *sub judice*. Yet I am accused of making a statement that held the then Premier in contempt, and of not substantiating my statement. When I make statements in the House no-one can accuse me of not proving those statements.

When the Leader of the Opposition was Premier I often asked him for information about the activities of the Housing Trust. On each occasion I was told, "I do not know whether the Housing Trust will supply me with that information but I will endeavour to obtain it." The Housing Trust is a so-called semi-governmental organization. If anybody were asked to classify the trust he would say that it was 99.9 per cent Government. The Leader of the Opposition took great pride in the fact that for many years he was Minister of Housing, and yet he had no department under that portfolio. If this Government provides for a Minister of Housing it will have the decency to provide for a Housing Department also. The Housing Trust would be the only organization that could be brought under the control of a Housing Minister. I assure members opposite that I am not

going to be like a parrot on this matter. The Premier has clearly explained that he did not have the details of these increases. The first I knew of these increases was when the member for Torrens asked a question.

Mr. Jennings: It was the first any of us knew.

Mr. RYAN: Other members of the Government can speak for themselves, but presumably they did not know. It was rather amusing that the article that appeared in the *News* about one hour after the member for Torrens made this statement concluded by saying that it was expected that numerous questions would be asked in the House that afternoon.

Mr. Casey: I wonder where the information came from.

Mr. RYAN: He has never told us. He can sit in his place and smile now. On the day the increases were announced he considered that they were savage and vicious.

Mr. Coumbe: I was reading from the newspaper on my desk; the *News* was out then.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Torrens is shown in *Hansard* as saying, when the increases were announced, that they were savage and vicious. For once I agree with the honourable member: they were savage and vicious. Yet the following day, when this debate came up, the member for Torrens denied that they were savage and vicious. From the remarks he made later, when the matter was under discussion, one could only understand that he agreed with them, that he did not consider these savage increases should be suspended or cancelled.

Mr. McKee: He agreed with them for political reasons.

Mr. RYAN: That is true. Members of the Opposition would be really happy in their own hearts if the Government did not act on these increases; they would be happy because they would think that the people would take this matter into their own hands and reprimand the Government for not taking action on the savage and vicious rises contemplated by the trust.

Mr. Coumbe: You have a fertile imagination.

Mr. RYAN: One does not need much imagination. I can place my own interpretation on what the member for Torrens said. His remarks appear in *Hansard*. I will stand up in this House and say that the increases by the Housing Trust were vicious, that they were savage, and that the Government was justified in advising the Housing Trust that it was not to proceed with them. My district has one of the largest percentages of Housing

Trust houses, and I would have much pleasure in going into my district and criticizing any Government that proceeded with the rises announced by the trust. This Government's action needs no defence.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): The increases imposed by the Housing Trust have been referred to as "savage" and "vicious".

Mr. Jennings: They were the terms used by the member for Torrens.

Mr. QUIRKE: Those terms have been used now by the member for Port Adelaide. I rise not to enter into the pros and cons of who said what but to defend at least two honourable men, and I couple with them their associate members. The two people against whom calumny has been levelled this afternoon are two of the most respected and hardest working officers in South Australia. I refer to the Chairman (Mr. Cartledge) and the General Manager (Mr. Ramsay) of the Housing Trust. We have heard suggestions today (and the honourable member for Port Pirie is one of the guilty men) that these men, whom we know to be honourable and completely above board in their administration, have conspired with the previous Government to impose vicious charges on the people as a political measure, and I will not let those suggestions pass unchallenged. What I should like now is for the honourable member for Port Pirie (he was the greatest offender) and the Minister of Education (who was also blameworthy, although possibly to a lesser extent) to rise in their places and apologize to two honourable men for the calumny they have levelled against them, and I, as a member here, would expect them to do that.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): In my opinion this whole question is rather suspicious, particularly in view of the performance of the honourable gentlemen opposite. There has been a deliberate attempt to try to twist the replies given by the Premier to questions asked in this House. The announcement of the rent increases was made in the *News* one afternoon. The honourable member for Torrens (who represents a district which I doubt would have any Housing Trust rental houses) was the first person to ask a question of the Premier in this House. It is true that the announcement was in the *News*, as the honourable member said, and the *News* came out later. The honourable member for Port Adelaide mentioned this fact, and I emphasize it. It was apparent, before the *News* went to print, that it was known that questions would be asked about the steep increases in



rent. I say without hesitation that the Premier was not aware of the details that had been sent out. However, certain honourable gentlemen opposite apparently received information that was not available to the Premier. Honourable members have only to add up two and two to work that out. In fact, the ordinary person in the street can work it out.

I will tell honourable members opposite the truth. I am not going to try to pull the wool over anyone's eyes, and I refuse to have ex-Ministers of a Government that has been rejected by the people of South Australia trying to pull the wool over my eyes. I challenge the member for Burra to say that what I am saying is not the truth; it was reported in the *News* that questions were going to be asked. Newspapers are not just pushed out in five minutes. Apparently certain information was available, and one can only try to imagine the source of that information. I do not think it would be the Railways Commissioner who released the information, because I question whether he would have the details of what came out in the press.

Mr. Jennings: It could have been the Director of the Zoological Gardens.

Mr. HURST: Yes. The member for Torrens asked a question and the Premier in his reply said that he had no doubt that, if increases were to be charged, they would be justified. People must have a highly developed sense of imagination to suggest that the Premier was aware of the details, if that is what they read into his answer. This is a hot political potato, particularly as the increases were so steep and savage.

Mr. Jennings: And so soon, although none had been made for 10 years.

Mr. HURST: Yes. The Premier could not know the details until the following day. Notices were received by tenants the day after the announcements were made, and they were released to the press when they were sent out. Apparently the information leaked to other quarters. The Labor Party acted immediately on a policy of reasonable rentals, but up to the present the Opposition has not commended the Government for its action. This increase would affect many thousands of people. The increase was steep and vicious and one that the average person could not afford. I question whether the increases were justified, and I accept the decision of Cabinet as being a fair and reasonable one applying to any increases that have to be made. The whole thing has a political odour. One honourable member has tried to involve

independent members of the board, but this is wrong and unjustified, as no implication or inference should be made against any board member. This proves that the whole thing is a political stunt, and that the action by the Government is right and proper. The accusations by Government members have apparently hit the nail on the head. It was suggested by one honourable member that no one could doubt the honesty of the Premier, but in the next breath he suggested that the General Manager and the Chairman of the trust should be asked for the facts. That clearly demonstrates the insincerity of Opposition members who have tried to make political capital, but the whole thing has boomeranged and they are now trying to drag red herrings across the trail. I support the wise action of the Premier, made in the interests of the people of this State as a whole. I hope that in future people will act more sincerely so that the facts are considered and not twisted out of their true context.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1840.)

#### MINISTER OF WORKS.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £5,248,850.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): When progress was reported yesterday I said that I would obtain a report for the Leader. The report states that the set-up of the Estimates in this section was altered in part to conform with a revised administrative and accounting arrangement in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and, in part, to show more completely than hitherto the wages expenditures of the department. The revised administrative and accounting arrangement followed a special investigation and recommendation of outside consultants which was arranged and approved by the previous Government. The details of rearranged accounting were arrived at after bringing into consultation both the Treasury officers and the officers of the Auditor-General.

A considerable proportion of the work done by the department, and therefore a considerable proportion of the salaries and wages, are eventually chargeable to Loan or other reimbursement works and not to Revenue. However, a good deal of costing analysis is often necessary before it can be decided how much of any individual employee's wages or engineer's salary is chargeable to each account. Earlier it was the practice to show in the

Budget in the first instance those salaries and wages which were expected to be wholly or partly a Revenue charge, and then to re-charge to other accounts the appropriate part of these. But for wages which were expected to be wholly charged elsewhere no amounts were shown in the Budget. For the sake of simplified accounting procedure and for complete information to Parliament, the procedure has been altered to show all construction and reimbursement wages in the first instance in the Budget and then to show total estimated re-charges.

It is undoubted that the figures shown in the columns as for 1964-65 were not actually listed in that form last year. They are shown in that way simply to give a valid comparison. The alternative would have been to leave the columns blank, in which case the Leader would have been fully justified in asking for comparable figures. This practice of attempting to show comparable figures when a re-arrangement becomes necessary is by no means new, and in fact has been done on a number of occasions by the previous Government. It was done in the 1964-65 Estimates by the previous Administration for the Public Buildings Department. This was an extensive re-arrangement in the course of which the whole of the salaries and wages for Revenue, Loan, and other purposes was shown in the first instance and then the amounts not ultimately chargeable to Revenue were deducted. It consolidated the previous rather fragmented arrangement and it showed for information the actual gross provisions for the previous year in the new form although they were not provided in that form in the previous Budget.

What has been done for the Engineering and Water Supply Department in this Budget is fully comparable with what was done by the previous Administration last year for the Public Buildings Department. It is again emphasized that there is nothing new in showing appropriations, particularly of wages, as a gross figure, and then deducting such part of them as may be expected to be finally charged to Loan or some other account. This has been done for many years, and has developed mainly because of requests in the House for more complete information.

The fact that about £4,200,000 is likely to be required this year for wages for construction and reimbursement works, as against an actual expenditure last year of £4,465,000, does reflect some cut-back in works, because last year's heavy rate of increase in Loan works of this department could not be maintained from the funds available. This will not mean retrench-

ments, but less casual labour will be recruited from time to time, and some resignations of workmen may not be replaced. The sum of £4,465,000 was undoubtedly not specifically listed in the Budget last year, but the vote itself was substantially provided through the Loan Budget. There is, of course, no possible suggestion that Parliament is being asked for a double vote in this case, for the Budget figures are all reduced to a net basis and the Appropriation Bill will authorize only the net figures. I have supplied the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with a copy of this report, and I hope that it is clearly understood. I express appreciation to the officers of the Treasury for making the report available in such a limited time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, who is unavoidably absent at present, I thank the Minister for making a copy of this report available. I am aware that the programme of reorganization undertaken just prior to the Minister's assuming his portfolio, which came into full effect during the last financial year, followed a similar programme in the Public Buildings Department, which was reorganized largely as a result of the work of the present Director and the Public Service Commissioner. Frankly, I had not appreciated that the reorganization of the department's administration would necessitate any extensive reorganization of the accounts, but I think the significant fact in what the Minister has just said is that the details of the rearranged accounting were arrived at after consultation with both Treasury officials and officers of the Auditor-General's Department. I think, therefore, that the Committee should accept the authenticity of the Minister's explanation, and I do so accept it. I think, too, that the Minister realizes that I would not have a complete appreciation of his report at the moment, in respect of the accounting procedures, and that the Leader may care to ask further questions on this matter later. However, the Opposition is prepared to accept the information for the time being.

Line passed.

Public Buildings Department, £2,994,182—  
passed.

Public Stores Department, £148,313.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I know that a problem has existed in this department, in regard to its store at Mile End, and the provision is probably included in the line, "Maintenance and repairs to Mile End property",

under contingencies. Will the Minister say whether the Railways Commissioner has finally decided that the department should no longer occupy its store at Mile End? About a year ago much money was spent on that store, to bring it up to present requirements, and the department was therefore reluctant to relinquish it.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand that that assumption is correct. We are doing our best to use that store for as long as we can, but I fear that we shall eventually have to leave it and find new premises.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £15,253.

Mr. HEASLIP: I notice that the provision for Murray River embankments across creeks is reduced by £1,000. What is the purpose of these embankments?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Provision is made to build embankments to protect the flow of the main channel of the Murray River, from which Renmark's water supply is taken. I assume that certain work has been done, and that a reduction is possible this year.

Mr. HALL: Last year £50 was allocated for the eradication of water hyacinth and the same amount is allocated this year. According to what I have read, water hyacinth has become a world-wide problem in fresh water rivers and lakes. I understand that it is a problem in Queensland. I am wondering how much of a threat it poses in the Murray River with its dams, such as the Chowilla dam. Can the Minister say what threat may be posed by it to South Australian waterways?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I presume that, at present, the threat is not dangerous because none of the £50 made available last year was spent. This matter has been and will continue to be watched to see that it does not become a danger. I believe this sum was allocated to meet any requirements that might arise by the spread of the weed, and to enable it to be attacked promptly.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Periodically water hyacinth appears on the Murray River, and steps have to be taken to keep it out of the way. I am interested in the contribution towards a topographical survey of the Torrens River of £3,000, which is a new line. This will assist the Torrens River Committee in its activities. The sum of £2,000 is provided as a contribution to the metropolitan drainage maintenance fund towards deficiency. I presume this is to provide for maintaining the Torrens River outlet to the sea, an obligation the department assumed many years ago. The

councils' contributions to this drainage scheme are fixed and, with the passage of time and the changing values of money, the amount the councils contribute has become inadequate. Therefore, it is essential for the Government to contribute more heavily each year to maintain the work. Will the Minister give an assurance on the facts I have given?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member's facts are correct.

Line passed.

#### MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Minister of Education Department, £8,536.

Mr. McANANEY: This appropriation seems to be an entry into a new field. Can the Minister of Education explain why it is included?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): This sum was previously included under the Education Department as distinct from the Minister of Education Department. The Minister of Education Department has now been separated from the Education Department and, therefore, the amounts are shown separately. This principle is employed in other departments.

Line passed.

Education Department, £19,576,754.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Large sums are shown for primary schools, technical schools and high schools. Can the Minister say whether this is the result of an increase in staff, or am I correct in assuming that there is additional provision to try to increase recruiting into the higher educational field to enable these schools to teach to matriculation level?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: For primary schools the provision for salaries at July rates is £6,352,000, for increments, £52,000, and for 100 additional teachers, £60,000. For technical schools the provision for salaries at the July rates is £2,425,000, for increments, £24,500, and for 146 additional teachers, £94,000. For high schools the provision for salaries at the July rates is £2,797,500, for increments, £30,000, and for 140 additional teachers, £98,000.

Mr. HUDSON: On the line "Allowances to students in training", the actual expenditure last year was £1,119,643. The amount proposed this year is £1,365,900, an increase of £246,257. Can the Minister say how much of that increase is taken up by the increased allowances, and how much provides for extra students in training?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The increased allowances granted to trainee teachers accounts for £205,000, and the balance is in respect of the extra trainees. I do not have the actual number, but I can get it for the honourable member.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister figures regarding subsidies for each type of school, and can he elaborate on departmental policy regarding subsidies?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The provision of subsidies for primary schools this year is £105,000, a decrease of £1,100; for area schools it is £17,000, an increase of £1,900; for technical schools, £38,300, an increase of £7,000; and for high schools, £77,000, an increase of £13,800.

Mr. Hudson: What is the total increase?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The total amount of subsidy payments for the current year is £237,300, which is 10 per cent greater than the amount spent in the last financial year. This whole matter has been under consideration for some time, because it was obvious that at the rate the subsidy finance was going it just would not last the year unless better control was exercised over it.

Mr. Shannon: It was a case of first in first served.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. That has been the policy in the past. As far as I know, no specific policy of control has been exercised in this matter in past years. I think I would be right in saying that the previous Government experienced this difficulty last year. In fact, at the end of the year we were more than £30,000 down in subsidy payments, and the department had to delay the payments until Supplementary Estimates were passed.

Mr. Clark: You had to be lucky to get a subsidy.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. That seems to me to be entirely wrong, particularly as some schools obviously are able to gather more funds and apply for subsidy payments in excess of what other schools are able to apply for. Therefore, it seems that there should be a policy of control whereby, for example, where there is a subsidy of more than £1,000 on the larger items the department should have notice of this to enable it to budget. Regarding the total funds, my officers are working on a plan whereby we can apportion subsidies roughly in the proportion of the enrolments at schools, so that schools will get fair treatment.

Mr. Shannon: You said recently that new schools required assistance in this field perhaps more than did old-established schools.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. We have a special provision whereby schools can get subsidy payments. Although I do not have the exact details with me today, I will bring down details of the provision whereby new schools can get started with funds. Obviously when the new schools open they do not have the funds available for desirable equipment.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister referred to 140 additional positions in technical schools and a somewhat similar number in high schools. Have these positions been filled, or are they merely positions that have been created? If they have been filled, does that indicate that the previous training programme is starting to show benefit?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It would be impossible for me to say whether all those positions had been filled. We are now getting towards the end of the year, and in the new year there will be many positions to be filled.

Mr. NANKIVELL: If the actual type of service of these teachers were not known, I take it it would be difficult to prepare a budget to provide for salaries. Will the Minister inquire and see what the position is?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. However, I point out that the department can estimate accurately what the position will be, because our research officers must keep a very close watch on the population of areas and the number of children likely to attend the schools. This is canvassed and is well known, and from this a close estimate can be made of the number of teachers required in any specific place at the beginning of a year. I should be surprised if these figures were not accurate.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As each position is filled or to be filled in a certain time, this could mean that the figure would increase substantially next year if some salaries are for the period February to June?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I hope that when allocating subsidies to schools, the Minister will consider the question of ovals at the Port Lincoln High School and the Cummins Area School. Additional provision has been made for oversea visits of officers. Can the Minister say whether any senior officers will be making oversea visits this year, and, if they will be, for what purpose?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In considering subsidies, the position of schools that

have embarked on projects as referred to by the honourable member will be taken into account. It would be unfair to put such schools in grave difficulties suddenly. Two teachers will be sent to Birmingham University to train as teachers for the blind, and senior staff will visit England to examine the latest method of teacher-training and other methods adopted in Great Britain in comprehensive schools.

Mr. RYAN: It is becoming difficult to get school caretakers to remain in their jobs because they must work their 40 hours in broken shifts. For instance, a caretaker may have to work his eight hours over a span of 12 or 14 hours a day. Some caretakers have suggested that their jobs should be combined with other duties so as to give them 40 hours a week in unbroken shifts. Will the Minister have this matter examined?

At present children starting school in the middle of the year must be five years of age on the first Monday after a certain date in June. This means that a child turning five on, say, June 28, may not be eligible to start with the mid-year intake, whereas in another year a child turning five on June 30 could be admitted. Will the department consider admitting, in the mid-year intake, all children who have turned five on July 1?

The department appoints teachers to infants schools at the beginning of the school year. The mid-year intake (in some cases, as many as 100 scholars) creates additional classes with no commensurate increase in the teaching staff. This means that the existing staff must cope with the additional scholars. Could the department appoint teachers to these infants schools in the middle of the year to overcome this staff deficiency?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to have those matters examined, and I shall inform the honourable member what can be done.

Mrs. STEELE: The Auditor-General's Report refers to land at Conyngham Street and Cator Avenue, Glenside, to be used for recreational facilities for the Adelaide Technical High School. Is any money provided under the line, "Contribution towards cost of developing and improving recreation grounds" to be spent on this school and, if so, what is intended to be done?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The money on this line is to provide more adequate sporting facilities where school playing fields are inadequate.

Mrs. STEELE: The Adelaide Technical High School is using grounds made available to it by the City of Burnside. Will further facilities be provided under this line?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Under Item 4 of the Auditor-General's Report, this area is about to be developed by the Education Department as playing fields and, I think, tennis courts for the Adelaide Technical High School.

Mr. CUMBE: In 1966 a new matriculation system for entrants to the university and other tertiary institutions will be introduced. Will Intermediate, Leaving, and Leaving Honours bursaries still be granted then, or will a special scholarship for the matriculation year be granted?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The line to which the honourable member refers provides for Intermediate and Continuation Exhibitions and released time scholarships. I cannot give the honourable member any information about matriculation scholarships at this juncture, but I shall endeavour to obtain it for him.

Mr. HALL: I understand that a new occupation centre is being built at Elizabeth. Can the Minister say when that work is likely to commence, and when the centre will be ready for the transfer of students from the existing centre?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. McANANEY: I have noticed that in some smaller schools headmasters and teachers are often over-burdened with clerical work. Will the Minister say whether clerical assistance is likely to be provided, so that more teachers could be made available?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I assure the honourable member that I should like to approve more clerical assistance in this direction, but our funds are limited, and we have to consider the matter carefully from the point of view of what we can do. I agree that we should use our teaching staff to the best advantage.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am disappointed that insufficient provision is made for education this year. It is only about £1,613,000 more than last year's provision, and with the increase in population the department will have insufficient funds to build the necessary schools. Both the departments of the Minister of Education and the Minister of Works will be hampered in their work. I think the Government would be well advised to study this provision carefully, because it is totally

insufficient to meet our present and future requirements. Money can be found by the Commonwealth Government for defence and other matters and, if we are to educate our children properly, money must be found for education.

Mr. Casey: Are you suggesting that the Commonwealth Government should cut down on defence expenditure?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No; my point is that when it is necessary money can be found.

Mr. Hudson: Do you support increased taxation for education?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I would support a small increase in taxation. Only this afternoon I took a deputation to the Minister, and these people were concerned. This is an urgent problem and we want results.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I fully appreciate the remarks of the honourable member. I

assure him that the Minister of Works and I are endeavouring to ensure the utmost co-operation between his department and my department with a view to getting schools built as close to the target date as possible.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES)  
BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendment to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 5, at 2 p.m.