

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 27, 1964.

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

QUESTIONS.

FUNERAL CHARGES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier any further information from the Prices Commissioner regarding funeral directors' charges?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a report from the Commissioner covering a wide range of commodities, and I am analysing the report with the object of making an appropriate submission to Cabinet. I will have some further questions to ask the Commissioner regarding his submissions. He has reported to me that funeral charges are unnecessarily high and that some action should be taken in that respect. However, I think the Leader will agree that until I have had an opportunity to examine fully the implications of the report and to confer with my colleagues in Cabinet it would not be appropriate for me to suggest what action should be taken, for ultimately different action or no action at all might be taken. I will inform the Leader as soon as I have something further regarding any action considered necessary.

OIL RESEARCH.

Mr. COUMBE: It was announced in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Premier had stated that the Government intended to invite an oil expert from Canada or the United States of America to this State to confer with officers of the Mines Department. Can the Premier enlarge upon this announcement? As the Director of Mines (Mr. Barnes) and the Deputy Director (Mr. Parkin) both have the admiration of members of this House, can the Premier say whether the Government, following the visit of this expert, will consider sending either of those officers abroad to gain first-hand and up-to-date information on the processing of natural gas in other countries?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has concluded an agreement with the Gas and Fuel Corporation of Alberta (a Government-constituted authority) for the release of one of its senior men to come to South Australia. This officer is a petroleum engineer who has had considerable technical experience generally, and who is experienced in evaluating the capacity of gas supplies. He

will spend some weeks here. He will inspect the field, having in his possession all of the information available to the department, and will give us some considered reports about the probable size of the field and the augmentation we should make to our Mines Department to cover this new phase of its work. Much more important to us than that is the fact that the authority has intimated that it is prepared to process any further information we have if we send it, and that all of its organization will be available for that purpose. Members will see that that is remarkably generous and of great importance to us, because it means that we have a highly qualified consultant available to us in connection with any problems that may arise.

SPEAR FISHERMEN.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The *Advertiser* of December 13, 1963, contained articles about spear fishermen, and one these contained remarks by Mr. Newlands, the Secretary of the Surf Lifesaving Association (South Australian Branch). He claimed that the activities of spear fishermen close to our beaches were drawing sharks and creating a danger to swimmers, thus causing a greater demand on the services of his members. The article went on to say that Mr. Alexander, a spokesman for people engaged in underwater activities, agreed that the people he represented would have to move their activities. Can the Minister of Works say whether this matter has been considered and whether it is contemplated that action will be taken to provide greater safety for swimmers in this State, particularly along our metropolitan and densely populated beaches?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As far as I know, the matter has not come before the Harbors Board officially, and I have not received any communication from anyone on it. I recall the article to which the honourable member refers. The question of who is to have the use of the water on our beaches is difficult. I have had interviews with people who have complained that their activities as spear fishermen have been interrupted by people who drive boats over them while they are in the water. They say that the sharp keels and propellers will injure them if they surface when the boats are passing over them. I have also had complaints from people who use small markers to do under-water work; they claim they have been cut adrift by boats passing overhead. The question arises of who has the strongest rights—the swimmer, the boat-owner or the spear fisherman. It is difficult to determine between the claims of these

people. The honourable member asked a more general question about whether any action should be taken to discourage spear fishermen from swimming close to the beaches. I shall examine the matter and ask the Harbors Board whether it has any information about it, and whether, if deemed advisable as a matter of policy, it is practicable to take action.

WOMEN'S GAOL.

Mrs. STEELE: Considerable public concern has been expressed at the delay in building a new women's gaol, and I understand that members of the Prisoners Aid Society, at their annual meeting last night, discussed this matter. I further understand that the site originally purchased at Northfield, adjacent to the Yatala Labour Prison, which already had a comfortable residence capable of being adapted as the nucleus of staff quarters, was considered unsuitable by the Public Buildings Department, which recommended another site. I understand that soil tests were being undertaken, but since then nothing has been heard of the proposed scheme. Meantime, additional accommodation has been provided at the Adelaide Gaol. Will the Premier ask his colleague for a full report on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

MURRAY BRIDGE OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of Tuesday last regarding an occupation centre for mentally retarded children at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that on receipt of the requirements from the Education Department for the conversion of the property in Cypress Avenue, Murray Bridge, for use as an occupation centre, it was necessary to prepare sketch plans and an estimate of cost for the work. These sketch plans, together with the estimate of costs, were completed and submitted to the Director of Education for his consideration. Advice was recently received from the Director of Education for the work to proceed, and a submission was made for an approval of funds. This approval of funds was obtained earlier this week. Because of the urgency of the work, the possibility of carrying out the work with departmental labour is being investigated. On present indications, the work could commence in October and should be completed early next year.

ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS: To explain my question, I shall refer to the beginning of a letter I received from the Minister of Education recently. The letter, dated July 20, is addressed to me and states:

I refer to the question you asked me in the House on June 10 concerning the flooding of the rooms of the Enfield High School.

The Minister summarized his letter with six points after a long and well-written preamble, so well written that I am sure the Minister must have written it himself. The Enfield High School Council found that points 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 were moderately unacceptable to it but, being a responsible body, decided that if point 5 were implemented it would forget the other points. Point 5 was:

It is proposed to install a stand-by electric pump to operate automatically when the existing pump either fails to operate or cannot cope with the water inflow.

That letter was written in answer to a question I asked on June 10, but the secretary of the council informed me last night that no evidence was apparent of anything being done. Will the Minister of Education, in view of the tolerant and co-operative attitude of the council, do his best to expedite this proposal?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Not only in view of the co-operative attitude of the Enfield High School Council but also because of the most co-operative attitude of the honourable member. I shall be delighted to expedite this matter.

NARACOORTE SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Works further information about providing a suitable water supply to the Naracoorte South Primary School Committee for watering the oval and surroundings of the school?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I discussed this matter with the Engineer for Water Supply (Country) in my office recently when the honourable member was present. I understand that he communicated with my colleague, the Minister of Education, on the matter and the Minister provided him with information suggesting that the best way to solve the problem would be to sink a bore and install a pump. However, this proposal has difficulties. Bores at Naracoorte, unless of the deep class, are plagued with fine sand which comes in with the inflow of water into the bore hole, and even with the most modern screens attached to the bore hole pump some sludging occurs. Mr.

Harvey, the officer in the department with whom I discussed the matter, is agreeable to supplying a water service point for use of the school committee. He suggests that, in order to provide sufficient for watering the oval in a short period, the committee should erect a 30,000-gallon tank and pump from it to the sprinkler head on the oval, as required. The Engineer-in-Chief will supply the water and the water point if the committee undertakes the other expenditure which, I understand, can be subsidized by the Education Department. Mr. Harvey has promised to assist the committee in every way with technical information, plans and specifications to enable the committee to have the installation put into operation. So, if the honourable member will remind me, I will endeavour to get the specifications from the department at the earliest possible moment so that he can discuss it with the committee over this weekend.

PORT BROUGHTON ROAD.

Mr. McKEE: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from the Minister of Roads on the progress of survey work carried out on the Port Pirie to Port Broughton road, to see whether the work is likely to commence soon?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. CURREN: On August 12 I read a letter from the Upper Murray Grapegrowers' Association seeking information on the price of a certain wine grape. I understand the Premier has some information on this subject. Will he give it to the House?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I obtained a full report from the Prices Commissioner on this matter. The report can be summarized in this manner:

The letter from the Upper Murray Grapegrowers' Association read by the member for Chaffey in the House concerning grape prices is not entirely accurate because the surplus of wine grapes last year which was stated to be due to sultanas being £5 a ton cheaper than the majority of other grape varieties which they displace was only a very minor reason for the surplus. The surplus of wine grapes last year mainly resulted from accumulated stocks of wine and spirit made from all grape varieties following the record 1962 vintage and the above-average vintage for 1964. In fact, for the 1963 vintage, the intake of sultanas delivered to wineries in S.A. was only 9,363 tons, compared with 36,875 tons in 1962. The 1964 vintage figures for sultanas are not yet available, but are not expected to be anywhere near the 1962 tonnage.

HALBURY SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mr. HALL: Early this week a new classroom was opened (and is now in use) at the small primary school at Halbury, a few miles north of Balaklava. The building has been over-taxed and has grown old, and I believe that the department is no longer prepared to spend further money on repairs. The school residence is not suitable now for a resident teacher and the future of the school is somewhat in doubt as long as the residence is in its present state. Has the Minister of Education any firm policy on whether or not the Government will renew the teacher's residence?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I do not think that the department has finally determined this matter, but in view of the honourable member's question I will take it up with the appropriate officer and get his report and recommendation and have a firm decision made soon. I will then let the honourable member know.

NEW COUNTRY PARTY.

Mr. HUGHES: I notice in this afternoon's *News* an announcement that a South Australian Country Party has been established. Does the Premier consider that this indicates that the country members of his own Party are no longer adequately protecting the interests of the country people in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have seen the report to which the honourable member refers and I notice that the proposed organization has its head office in Adelaide.

UNDERGROUND WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am concerned at some inherent dangers to heavy capital investments being made by market gardeners in the Adelaide Plains generally, and in particular in the western part of my electoral district. My concern arises from the fact that the gardeners' investments directly rely on underground water supplies and the unrestricted tapping of these supplies could well lead to the lowering of water tables to a dangerous level, with the intrusion of brackish water. This could adversely affect the interests of all landholders in the area. Is the Premier aware of the situation and is any form of supervision contemplated in regard to the taking of underground water supplies in given areas of the State where major problems may arise because of the excessive use of such supplies?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think the honourable member is aware that

there is no law or riparian right in relation to underground water supplies. Consequently, it is rather difficult to determine who has the right to water below the ground. This matter was considered by Parliament some time ago. It was raised by the honourable member's colleague in an adjoining district and was the subject of legislation that provided for two things: first, the Mines Department would be able to protect underground water supplies from pollution; and secondly, there was a proposal that the department would be able to take certain action to control these supplies in any particular area. However, the second provision was not acceptable to Parliament, and in fact I do not believe it was acceptable to my Party, because of its wide implications.

The Government is conscious of the problem in the honourable member's district. The Minister of Works has given a tremendous amount of attention to that problem, and relief may be afforded to the area by means of effluent from the big plant being built there. This matter is being examined at present by a special committee. Whether or not this proposal is feasible it is far too early for me to say, and the cost of the water that could be obtained from that source also has yet to be ascertained. Much effluent water would exist there, and if the water was found to be suitable and did not contain much saline matter it might be a means of giving relief to the area. The matter is being examined by the Mines Department, and careful records of water levels are being kept. The best way to ensure protection might be to publish authentic statistics of the effect of bores on water levels, for that in itself would be a warning to other people who might contemplate sinking bores.

BEEF ROADS.

Mr. CASEY: Last Tuesday, when I asked a question concerning beef roads I quoted a paragraph from a letter, a copy of which had been handed to me, bearing the signature of Senator Paltridge. I quoted that letter because it contained a statement by the Senator that conflicted with information I had previously received from the Premier. The Premier promised that he would bring down the docket relating to this matter. Can he now tell me the contents of that docket?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The correspondence the honourable member quoted was a reply from the Leader of the Government in the Senate to the effect that no application was before the Commonwealth

Government at present. In reply to that, may I quote a letter that I wrote on August 12 to the Prime Minister, as follows:

I note that the Budget Papers do not contain any reference to the beef cattle roads in South Australia. You will remember that this was one of the matters I mentioned to you at our last interview in which there was an outstanding reply. As there is considerable interest in this matter in South Australia, will you please advise me of the position?

That makes it clear not only that an application was before the Commonwealth, but that I had personally interviewed the Prime Minister concerning it. Incidentally, it was one of the matters upon which the Prime Minister had promised me a reply prior to his leaving for the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, but because of his illness I had not had a reply. The answer to the honourable member is that the statement he quoted from the letter was not factually correct.

SHOOTING REGULATIONS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was approached recently by a citizen who had just been issued with a sportsman's gun licence at his local police station, for which he paid 10s. He expressed disappointment that he was not able to obtain at the police station any information on shooting prohibitions and regulations in South Australia. As I understand that such a booklet is issued in Victoria, will the Minister of Agriculture consider printing a booklet even if it is necessary to increase the price of the gun licence slightly to cover the cost of printing?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I strongly favour the law being written so clearly that it can be understood by everyone. The law that covers shooting (the Animals and Birds Protection Act) is an old Act that has been amended from time to time and is in rather a bad state. Some months ago I arranged for it to be completely overhauled. This work has reached an advanced stage, and I hope that before long I shall be able to introduce a Bill which has been approved by the Government to amend this Act and which will clearly express what can and cannot be done. If that Bill eventually becomes law, we can then consider issuing a booklet, which I think can be done without increasing the cost of gun licences. We could then give some instructions stemming from the new Act, should there be one. It is important to provide ground marks to indicate to people where they cannot shoot. The comparatively

new wild life section of the Fisheries and Game Department has erected many notices on sanctuaries so that shooters can easily see where they must not shoot. Because of these notices, it will be reasonable to insist on a closer adherence to the law.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. RYAN: During the Address in Reply debate I referred to what I considered were anomalies in the payment of subsidies by the Education Department and I gave some examples. In the last few days much has been said about this matter. I have made numerous inquiries of schools, school councils and committees whether they have ever seen an official list issued by the department of the items on which a subsidy may be paid. My inquiries brought a negative result. The people concerned know only that certain equipment can be purchased on subsidy because it was the case in the past. The Education Department has informed school councils and committees that if they want to purchase equipment they must seek the approval of the department first, but it has often taken the department nearly two years to decide whether certain equipment can be bought on subsidy. Can the Minister of Education say whether there is an official list of the items that can be bought on subsidy, and, if there is not, can he say why? Will the Minister ask the department to consider the compilation of such a list so that the present confusion in the minds of people who are greatly concerned may be avoided?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I was personally indebted to the honourable member for raising this question in the Address in Reply debate, because I had never seen any official or unofficial list before, for the good reason that one had never been compiled. Like Topsy the scheme had "just grown", so to speak. As there was no complete list available, I asked for a list of the items that could be obtained on subsidy. I will not quote the whole list because it has been rather hastily compiled. It comprises five typed foolscap pages of the items in alphabetical order. I will mention a few of them to give the honourable member an idea of the contents of the list. Under the letter "A" appear aids to teaching, art material (not consumable), air coolers (evaporative), adding machines, atlases and aquariums. Under the letter "W" appear wireless equipment, water coolers, wheel barrows, washing machines, water bags and waterproof clothing. That gives a brief summary of the list.

I give credit to the honourable member for raising what I consider is an important question and it is one of the reasons that prompted me to make the decision I announced to the House yesterday. I said I had decided to make a personal Ministerial investigation of the whole question of subsidies. I believe the position has got completely out of hand and there does not seem to be any proper order or system as to the types of articles and services that are subsidized. It seems that an infinite number of people are virtually giving decisions, in the sense that they are making recommendations which are included in a schedule. I think it is a mistake to have this wide variety of items subject to subsidy. From my hurried reading of them, some should never have been included, whereas on some of the important ones there should be much greater assistance than there is. I am sure the teaching profession would support me, because it has raised the same problem with me, and I believe most parent bodies would do likewise. Only a limited amount is available for subsidies each year, about £250,000, and the member for Port Adelaide would be the first to agree with me that it is better, in the interests of the schools, the children and the teachers, that the most important articles should be subsidized before some of the unimportant and, in my opinion, irrelevant ones.

MEAT PRICES.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier obtained an explanation from the Prices Commissioner of meat prices being expected to be lower this week?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A report from the Prices Commissioner states:

Whilst market quotations have remained fairly firm for some weeks, the statement that indications were that retail prices of lamb would be reduced was firstly made due to the fact that a number of butchers have been operating on margins considered to be excessive, and it can be expected that these margins will be reduced; secondly, that following slightly lower market prices on August 19 wholesale prices were reduced by 2d. a pound.

POINT LOWLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY: It has been reported to me that applications for small areas of land near Point Lowly lighthouse, on which to erect small week-end shacks, have been considerably delayed, and no satisfaction has been received by the applicants. Will the Minister of Lands inquire whether there has been undue delay and, if there has been, the reason for it?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL.

Mr. RICHES: For some years Port Augusta has been looking forward to the erection of a new hospital. At least five years ago the need appeared to be recognized by the Hospitals Department, and before the Minister of Health and Dr. Rollison went overseas plans for a new hospital were submitted to the local board. Since then the plans have been reviewed and others submitted. I was informed in this House in 1961 that negotiations had reached the stage when progress could be expected. I understand that two years ago the Minister of Works addressed a public meeting at Port Augusta and told the people that before the end of the year they could expect concrete development. That was reported in the local newspaper: I did not hear the Minister myself. I have also read statements from the Minister of Health that Port Augusta could expect a commencement on the hospital there immediately the Port Lincoln hospital was completed. I am asking this question at the request of the Port Augusta branch of the Labor Party, which is concerned about this matter. Will the Minister now have the position examined? If he cannot (and I do not expect that he can this afternoon) make a statement on the actual stage that negotiations have reached, and what the situation really is in the building of a hospital there, will he give me a reply as soon as possible?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be happy to get a report for the honourable member. I do not recall the statement that he has attributed to me as reported in the local press at Port Augusta. As he has said, he was not at the meeting. I wish he had been for it was a rather good political meeting and I should have welcomed his attendance. I shall have to consult my colleague the Minister of Health and also the Public Buildings Department.

GOODWOOD CROSSING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Several times I have raised in this House the matter of the discomfort of people living near the Victoria Street railway crossing in Goodwood because of the loudness of the warning bells. This is especially annoying in the summer and causes undue loss of sleep, and inconvenience. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Railways to consider having the crossing warning device investigated in the hope of meeting the complaints of nearby residents?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

SNOWTOWN COURTHOUSE.

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a time table for the building and completion of the Snowtown courthouse and police buildings, financial provision for which was approved in the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will get a report for the honourable member.

SHOW ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HEASLIP: Normally Parliament adjourns for the period of show week. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to adjourn the House during that period and on what days it will stand adjourned?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As the honourable member has said, it has been the custom for the House to adjourn for the period of the show. I have discussed this matter with one or two honourable members, who have signified their desire that the House be adjourned. In those circumstances, the House will not sit next Thursday; it will sit on only Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, and will not sit at all the following week.

BOARDING ALLOWANCE.

Mr. CASEY: Recently I received a letter from a person whose address is The Stockowners Shearing Limited, 263 Wakefield St., Adelaide. That is not an unusual address for some people, especially as this man is a shearer by trade. His address normally could be anywhere in South Australia, or in any other State for that matter, because, as I understand it, he follows the sheds for practically the 12 months of the year. Unfortunately, with the break-up of his family, his children are under his jurisdiction and they are being boarded. One of his children is studying to be a teacher. He has made a claim to the Education Department for boarding allowances but, unfortunately, he has been told that the area in which his son is living is classified as his home. I should be quite happy to give the Minister this letter. Will he look into the matter and see whether this gentleman cannot be recognized as eligible to receive the boarding allowance, because of the fact that he has no permanent home in Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: At the first hearing of the letter from which the honourable member quoted I should think that probably the departmental view, rightly so, is that if the address of the parent is in Adelaide he would not qualify under a strict

interpretation of the regulations for a boarding allowance. However, if there is a discretion to grant an exemption, it seems to me this would be a good case for it. If the honourable member would let me have the letter I should be pleased to investigate the matter personally and see whether it is possible to do something to assist what appears to be a deserving case.

SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.

Mr. SHANNON: I have purposely delayed asking this question in order that the Leader of the Opposition might follow up the question he asked earlier in the week regarding happenings at the Yatala Labour Prison. He was promised that a report would be made available. I understand from the Premier that it has now been made available to the Leader. In view of the very dubious types of people for whom certain of our members take up the cudgels, I should like to know whether the report on this case discloses that the offence committed by this particular prisoner was a personal attack upon a warder, whether one of his convictions was for an attack upon a police officer, whether other convictions included three for carnal knowledge, and whether, in other words, this particular prisoner is of the type upon whom nothing but a fairly severe type of corrective punishment could have any effect?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member asked a question on this matter and asked me to get a report which, of course, deals not with the history of the prisoner but with the question that was raised. The Sheriff and Comptroller of Prisons reports:

Prisoner Peter Ramsay Ward committed a very serious offence against a prison officer at Yatala Labour Prison on June 14, 1964, when he was being placed in his cell during the lunch hour. His cell was then located in a division on one of the upper floors of the prison. A number of other young criminals were also confined in this area. The offences committed by the prisoner Ward are as follows:

- (1) Assaulting a prison officer.
- (2) Disobeying an order of a prison officer.
- (3) Using indecent and threatening language.

A report of this was submitted to me by the Superintendent of the prison and, owing to the enormity of the offences, I directed that the matter be heard before two visiting justices of the peace. On June 22, 1964, a full inquiry was conducted by the visiting justices in the presence of the prisoner. Evidence was given on oath. After an investigation had been made the visiting justices found that the prisoner did commit the offences and awarded the following punishment:

- (1) Imprisonment for two months and during this period to serve two weeks in solitary confinement on bread and water in two periods of one week's duration.
- (2) Two months' imprisonment, concurrent with previous sentence.
- (3) Two months' imprisonment and during this period to serve two weeks in solitary confinement in two periods of one week's duration.

The sentences imposed were fair and could not be considered as harsh. Section 48 of the Prisons Act states that when a serious offence is committed by a prisoner two visiting justices shall make the necessary inquiry. The visiting justices may on their discretion:

- (1) Sentence the prisoner to be kept at hard labour for any time not exceeding one year.
- (2) Sentence the prisoner to be kept in solitary confinement for any portion of the said time, not exceeding three months, in periods, none of which shall exceed one month, and which shall be at intervals of at least one month.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my question earlier in the week concerning the same prisoner at Yatala Labour Prison who has been given solitary confinement on bread and water?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a report from the Sheriff that is on similar lines to the one I just gave Mr. Shannon and is as follows:

On June 22, 1964, prisoner Peter Ramsay Ward who is serving a sentence at Yatala Labour Prison appeared before two visiting justices of the peace for breaches of the Prisons Act. He was charged as follows:

- (1) Assaulting a prison officer.
- (2) Disobeying an order of a prison officer.
- (3) Using indecent and threatening language.

The prisoner pleaded not guilty to counts (1) and (2) and guilty to count (3). Witnesses were called and the evidence was taken down in writing. The court found the charges proved and imposed penalties as follows:

- (1) Imprisonment for two months and during this period to serve two weeks in solitary confinement on bread and water in two periods of one week's duration.
- (2) Two months' imprisonment, concurrent with previous sentence.
- (3) Two months' imprisonment, and during this period to serve two weeks in solitary confinement in two periods of one week's duration. The sentence imposed to be cumulative with count (1).

This means that the prisoner was ordered to serve an additional four months' imprisonment, and during the four months, to serve four weeks' solitary confinement in four periods each of one week. The prisoner, although only 20 years of age, has already built up a record. He has ten (10) convictions including those for

shop-breaking and larceny, illegally using motor vehicles, carnal knowledge, assaulting police and garage breaking and larceny. This department has been advised that there are now six (6) outstanding warrants for his arrest. Included in these are warrants for dangerous driving and resisting arrest. He will be apprehended for these offences on discharge from prison. The offences referred to at the prison were committed on June 14, 1964, when he was being locked in his cell on one of the upper floors. At the same time a number of other young prisoners were locked in their cells.

Ward abused and threatened Prison Officer Keynes. He then caught Keynes around the throat with both hands and made every effort to force him over a hand rail to the ground floor. Prison Officer Pratt pulled the prisoner away. If the officer had fallen he may have been killed or seriously injured. Prior to being sentenced for these offences prisoner Ward was difficult to handle; he was most defiant and resented authority. He is now well behaved. Ward has served two weeks' confinement in his own cell, and during this period received bread and water. He will not be required to serve a further two weeks' confinement in his cell.

On February 17, 1964 (S.G.P. 132/64) a report was submitted recommending that certain of the punishment sections of the Prisons Act be revoked. This included the section dealing with solitary confinement and a diet of bread and water. This is now with the Parliamentary Draftsman and in the course of being drafted.

LAND LICENCES.

Mr. HUGHES: Portion of a letter I received from one of my constituents states:

This year I received an account from the Department of Lands for the annual licence number 2841, hundred of Wallaroo, for the amount of £6. On June 25 this year I wrote to the Director of Lands asking for pensioner's concession, as the other pensioners with similar blocks had accounts for only 5s. I have had no reply in nearly two months. Two years ago I wrote to the department with regard to the same matter, and was just ignored.

Does the Lands Department grant concessions to pensioners as indicated in that letter? Are some of those annual licences issued for 5s., and, if so, why are others raised to £6? Further, can the Minister of Lands say whether it is the policy of his department to ignore letters on this matter?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No, it is not the policy of the department to ignore letters, and I will make inquiries in that regard. I know of no licences issued to pensioners at special concession rates of 5s. a year, but I know that on properly surveyed blocks rates have been raised to £6 a year. I will obtain a full report on the matter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DOCTORS.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. LAWN: Last Tuesday afternoon I asked the Premier whether reciprocal arrangements existed between Australia and West Germany in regard to medical practitioners. I followed that question with another one in regard to the method of treating arteriosclerosis. I should like to make this request to the press, if I may, that the correction that I hope will be made in the newspaper be displayed just as prominently as the incorrect report of the question. I am reported on page 1 of yesterday's *Advertiser* as having asked the Premier a question, as follows:

Later, Mr. Lawn asked the Premier whether the fact that a number of South Australian people had been apparently cured of arteriosclerosis by German doctors—despite insistence by South Australian doctors that their cases were incurable—could have resulted in the decision not to recognize the qualifications of West German doctors.

The editorial of today's *Advertiser* carries another statement implying that I am advocating bringing German doctors to Australia, with the result that Sir Philip Messent, Chairman of the Medical Registration Board, has made a statement to the *News* today displayed with a three-column heading "Migrant doctors 'untrained'." The report reads:

Few foreign doctors migrating to South Australia were adequately trained as general practitioners, Medical Registration Board Chairman, Sir Philip Messent, said in Adelaide today.

Later he connects that with my question to the Premier. I should like to quote from the first *Hansard* proof that was delivered yesterday morning. I congratulate the *Hansard* reporters on hearing and reporting my question correctly and it is obvious from the reply from the Premier that he, too, understood my question. *Hansard* reports:

Mr. LAWN: I know of arteriosclerosis sufferers for whom the Australian Medical Association holds no hope as to treatment. The Premier showed me a docket in June this year which stated that other patients who had been to Kassel in West Germany for treatment at Dr. Muller's clinic had all returned after having been successfully treated. As the Premier has said that medical degrees conferred on doctors in West Germany are not recognized here, could this be the reason for the Australian Medical Association's not recognizing methods of treatment used successfully in West Germany?

How the press can say from that that I am asking for the importation of German doctors, I do not know. I am simply trying to obtain

in South Australia the same successful method as used in Germany today for treating arteriosclerosis. I am not asking for doctors to be brought out, except that I have requested the Premier to bring out the doctor who is practising this method so that he can show our own doctors how to do it. That is all I am asking in the way of importation of doctors. What I said in my question was understood by our *Hansard* reporters. I hope that the press will clear that up.

THE SPEAKER: The honourable member's privilege, as I understand him, is the hope that the press will correct its statement?

Mr. LAWN: Yes.

THE SPEAKER: I hope it will.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BUILDERS.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I ask leave to make a further personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. LAWN: Again I have to refer to the *Advertiser*: in this instance to an article that appears on page 6 of that newspaper of Wednesday, August 26. The article has a prominent heading, and I hope the press will give this correction as much prominence as it gave the article. Under the heading "Licensing of Builders" appeared the following:

Although the Government had been considering for some time legislation which could raise South Australian house-building standards by requiring the licensing of builders, no satisfactory proposal had yet been formulated, the Premier told Mr. Lawn (ALP) in the Assembly yesterday.

I do not claim the credit for asking that question; it was asked by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings). It is beyond my comprehension how the press could make this mistake because, as all members know, I am much more photogenic than my colleague. As a result of that article, I received correspondence today from the Builders and Allied Trades Association referring to the question that I was reported in the *Advertiser* to have asked the Premier. I ask that this error be corrected, and I shall be pleased to pass on the correspondence to the member for Enfield.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CONSTITUTION BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In the course of a debate in the House yesterday the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) purported to quote from

a speech that I had made at the University of Adelaide. Actually, I think he was purporting to quote from a reply that I gave to a question at a meeting at the university. The honourable member said that I had said this:

The reason why the Opposition was anxious for this to happen—

that is, for you, Mr. Speaker, to use a casting vote on the Constitution Bill in relation to the Ministry—

was that it wanted the opportunity to challenge in the courts of law the Constitutional validity of what you did and that was to be a dress rehearsal for a similar proceeding on the next Constitutional Bill—one dealing with electoral plans.

I regret I was not in the House at the time the honourable member said that, for I believe he has been misled. I do not assign any blame to him, but I can conclude only that the young Liberal at the university who reported this to him had the intelligence quotient that is normal amongst those people. What the honourable member has reported me as saying is almost the diametrical opposite of what I did say. In fact, the reason why the Labor Party had a 19-19 vote on that Bill was to prevent any dress rehearsal—and this is what I said at the university—of the subsequent vote on the later Bill. That occurred because of certain things that had been judiciously leaked to the press by members of the Party opposite concerning their later plans for that Bill. The Labor Party and I have never suggested that members on this side of the House at any time believed there could be any challenge to the Constitutional validity of a Speaker's casting vote upon a Constitution Bill when this House was evenly divided.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked leave to make a personal explanation but I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Speaker will decide those questions.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that; I do not suggest there is any other way.

STATE BANK REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report and accounts of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1964.

Ordered that report be printed.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) 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 Public Finance Act, 1936-1960.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this very short Bill is to increase the extent of the Governor's Appropriation Fund from £400,000 to £600,000 and to increase the amount that may be appropriated for new lines from £100,000 to £200,000.

Part VI A of the principal Act, which deals with expenditure under warrants, empowers His Excellency the Governor in any financial year to appropriate by warrant up to £400,000. Of this amount, not more than £100,000 can be appropriated for new purposes. The object of this is to enable the public business to be carried on pending Supply or Appropriation. This provision was inserted in the principal Act in 1949, and the amount has not since been raised although the extent of actual expenditure has almost quadrupled, having been raised from some £29,500,000 to £112,500,000. During last financial year Supplementary Estimates were required at a relatively early stage in the year, and this year it is possible that difficulties may call for even earlier Supplementary Estimates if the figure of £400,000 remains. It could be extremely difficult if there were a lack of Appropriation in the middle of an election year.

The attached Bill will raise the figure as I have indicated. The Government does not desire to seek an extension greater than is reasonably necessary, and has decided that the new figure should be substituted. I think the extent of the Appropriation Fund was £200,000 when the Budget of this State was for only £1,500,000. Honourable members will appreciate that it is necessary to have funds to meet emergencies that may arise from time to time. This sum is much more stringent than the sums provided in other States and by the Commonwealth Government. We believe it is necessary to have a reasonable sum appropriated to meet any unforeseen circumstances that may arise from day to day.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 26. Page 635.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): The Bill is unusual, to say the least, and I have no hesitation in opposing it. I expect that most members will do likewise. However, that remains to be seen as already members on both sides of the House have indicated their support of it. I say emphatically that I am definitely in favour of a new hall for the city. In fact, I favour new halls being erected in the city, suburbs or country because they spell progress, and I believe in fostering progress which, in turn, leads to greater prosperity. Clause 2 of the Bill states:

"the festival hall" means the festival hall, buildings, furniture, fittings and equipment, works and conveniences authorized by this Act to be constructed and provided.

Clause 3 does not indicate what the hall will be used for or its design, and I doubt whether the Premier can tell the House exactly the purpose for which this hall will be used. Admittedly, it can be used for many purposes. Does the Premier intend to approve a design for an all-purpose hall, a concert hall, or a theatrical hall? According to experts, an all-purpose hall would become a white elephant, as has been the case in many parts of the world. Recently, an eminent British conductor, Dr. Boyd Neel, who since 1953 has been Dean of the Faculty of Music at the University of Toronto (and I understand he has a degree in medicine) visited Adelaide. At Toronto he master-minded the construction of a £1,000,000 music building. In offering expert advice to the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and city councillors, he said:

Don't try to make the hall an all-purpose theatrical hall, it just simply won't work. You cannot have theatre and concerts in the same hall because the acoustic problem is entirely different. The surface of the earth is littered with white elephants of this nature.

I do not know the gentleman personally, but I understand that he is a world expert on this subject.

Mr. Loveday: He is a world-renowned musician.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, and a doctor of medicine. Dr. Neel advised that, if the building of a concert hall was uppermost in the minds of city councillors, this hall could become the centre of culture and other activities. I believe that Adelaide needs a cultural centre: any city with a growing population needs one.

Mr. Coumbe: The council agrees with the view of Dr. Neel.

Mr. CASEY: It is not in the Bill, and that is what I am speaking to.

Mr. Coumbe: It will not be an all-purpose hall.

Mr. CASEY: It could be used for conventions as well as concerts, but I am sure the board of management of the Hotel Australia would react strongly to that suggestion, particularly if the hall were built near the hotel. Dr. Neel emphasized:

The surroundings for a concert hall should be the most important feature. The approaches and the foyer should be splendid and there should be restaurants and bars. Art exhibitions could be held in the foyer and even floral displays.

No doubt Dr. Neel was basing his statement on the oversea trend. The important point he stressed (and I agree with him, as I appreciate good music) was that the most pleasant part of any concert was to discuss it in restful surroundings. We need go no further than that. If honourable members have been to a symphony concert they will know how pleasant it is to discuss the concert during the intermission under those conditions. For people to be able to compare the sounds that have appealed to each and every one of them, not only with symphony concerts but also with any type of light opera or anything to do with music or culture, it is advisable for the surroundings to be such as to fit in with the construction of the building.

I am speaking only to the Bill. I cannot understand exactly what is in the council's mind and what it intends to do, but this is as I see the Bill before us. If we regard this matter from a theatrical angle, we must realize that we have in Adelaide a small theatre at Hilton known as Theatre 62, which, I understand, is used exclusively for theatrical work. In July of this year a leading overseas actress, appearing in a programme called *Masks and Faces*, which was, apparently, a great success overseas, could draw only a handful of people, even though the local papers and critics were full of praise for the performance. The *Advertiser* on July 14, 1964, stated:

This is a one-woman show, a one-person show, the like of which Adelaide has rarely seen; not that Adelaide will see it if it dribbles along in one's and two's, as it did last night. It was a near-empty theatre.

I am afraid that sums up the attitude of many Adelaide people towards a play of this nature. It is only a small theatre, capable of holding about 250 people.

I do not wish to condemn theatrical plays in Adelaide just because of the article I mentioned. Nevertheless, this programme *Masks and Faces* had the blessing of the British Council, which, according to information I obtained from the Parliamentary Library, was inaugurated in November, 1934, for the purpose of promoting a wider knowledge of the English language abroad and of developing closer cultural relations between the United Kingdom and other countries to the benefit of the British Commonwealth of Nations. That is the position in the development of cultural relations between one country and another within the British Commonwealth. We have a play sponsored by the British Council coming to Adelaide and being attended by only a handful of people. I do not know why it is, but I am afraid that it does happen in Adelaide. Nevertheless, these plays are essential and if they are here then people should attend more regularly and show greater interest in the cultural side of things.

Mr. Hall: Are you speaking of professional or amateur plays?

Mr. CASEY: This was a professional show as far as I know; I do not want to be quoted on that, for I am only guessing. It was stated in the *Advertiser* that the lady was a leading British actress.

Mr. Riches: Many of those productions are restricted to people in the higher income group.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, and another point is involved. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to attend any of the Festival of Arts productions. Not many country people are able to come to Adelaide for theatrical productions, because of their employment and the long distances to be travelled. It is difficult for country people to participate in this type of entertainment. It is interesting to see the member for Adelaide and the member for Torrens agreeing on a matter in this House, but that may be understandable because they both stand to benefit directly from the festival hall, because they will live in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. Bywaters: How would they benefit?

Mr. CASEY: They would benefit culturally, no doubt. But what is the position of country members and their constituents? They would probably have little use for such a hall, because of the isolated areas in which some live. Therefore, I do not see why the whole State should be asked to contribute £500,000 towards its construction. What is happening in country areas today? If a new

town hall, civic centre, or institute is contemplated by a local government body, or some local organization, no money for such a project comes from this Parliament. The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) could give a much better description of this than I, because he has a case at first hand, and he knows just how country towns are treated today in the matter of Government grants. The money required for a community project in most country towns has to be raised within the particular community. Why could not the same procedure be adopted for the festival hall?

I see no reason why the Adelaide City Council, in its strong financial position, could not borrow money under the Local Government Act to finance this project, because that is what country towns have to do, and they have done it ever since the Local Government Act has been in operation. How many country members in this House have asked for important works to be undertaken in their districts? Practically every country member has asked this session for something that he considers to be highly important to his district, but all he has received has been a brush-off, to put it politely. The Adelaide City Council has full powers under the Local Government Act to undertake this project without any Government assistance whatsoever and, indeed, it will directly benefit by the erection of the festival hall, as will municipal councils in close proximity. Why cannot they help the Adelaide City Council and have a committee formed of representatives of suburban councils, instead of asking the whole State to finance the hall? In my opinion the £500,000 involved could be used for important works wanted by country members. I take great exception to the Premier's public announcement that the Government would give this large sum towards the project. The matter should have been referred to Parliament before any public announcement was made. The Premier has done this sort of thing on numerous occasions, as Mr. Lawn pointed out yesterday. There is nothing concrete in the Bill stipulating what type of hall it will be and what the design will be, or whether several halls will be incorporated in the one building. If there were several halls it would probably be called a cultural centre. I do not know. I can only imagine that it will be one hall, but I may be wrong. We do not know what the Premier has in mind when he says he is prepared to approve the design. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I was disappointed to hear the member for Frome speak as he did and I hope that the House will not take a parochial view of the proposals. The capital city is the focal point of the State in the minds of the local population and visitors from other parts of Australia and overseas. Pride in a State must be shown through the buildings in the capital city, which the populace, to a degree, is prepared to support. I recall that when it was proposed to enlarge Parliament House back in the early 1930's there was great opposition to the suggestion because there were outstanding outside basic requirements at the time. The dignity of South Australia was involved at the time in the completion of the building. It was necessary to have a centre of government that would indicate the importance and aspirations of the State. The provision of a festival hall in the capital city ensures that it will be placed at a point to which access can be had by people from all over the State. It is not necessarily just for those who reside in the metropolitan area.

The recent Festival of Arts was an instance of how far folk will travel to enjoy the cultural things which the festival provides. I disagree with my friend, the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), when he suggests that country folk would not benefit very much from a festival hall in the city. I consider there will be many occasions on which people from far and wide will converge on Adelaide to enjoy what is being presented in the festival hall.

We have had 128 years of rather hard pioneering in South Australia, and I feel that we are emerging to a condition where the State as a whole can afford to spend some money on the aesthetic things of life. I believe quite firmly and deeply that as a people we cannot live by bread alone, as it were. We need, apart from our daily interests and daily chores, some interests to take us out of ourselves. Bearing in mind, amongst other things, the fewer working hours in the week, I believe there is no better way of making the best use of leisure than to have some interest outside our own immediate avocations.

I have no doubt that a big proportion of those people who are neurotic or suffering mental illness are afflicted because they have had no outlet, no outside interest, to occupy their minds. If we can promote culture and the arts and do things that will draw people out of their daily routines we shall be doing a good which will go beyond the immediate confines of home and district and become a community and a national matter.

The safeguards provided in this Bill are sound. First, £100,000 is provided for the purchase of a suitable site, and that site must be approved by the Premier as being suitable. The sum of £400,000 is provided as a gift to the Adelaide City Council towards the construction and equipping of the hall, so in fact a total of £500,000 is being provided. In addition to that, the sum of £400,000 is being provided by way of a 30-year loan at 4½ per cent interest. The safeguard regarding the money to be made available will ensure that there will be no repetition of those unhappy situations in Sydney in connection with the building of the opera house. An upper limit exists on the amount the Government will provide, and should the cost of the structure not amount to the £1,000,000 now envisaged the Government's contribution may be reduced. This is common sense; there is no risk that there will be *ad lib* spending on this project.

I should like to expand on the need for promoting pride in city and State. It comes immediately to my mind that in most capital cities, and certainly those in the old countries, are halls that are acclaimed all over the world. Among these are the Albert Hall in London and the Vienna Opera House; these halls indicate to the world at large the interest taken by the people of these countries in arts and culture generally. I think that, as we have emerged through difficult periods of building this State of South Australia, the people are entitled to have some moneys expended on things that are not just the material things of life.

As this Bill relates specifically to the Adelaide City Council, it will be referred to a Select Committee in accordance with Standing Orders, so I shall content myself with saying what I have already said. I hope there will not be a parochial viewing of this project, because the needs of the whole State are being acknowledged in this proposal. I support the Bill.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) has appealed to members not to adopt a parochial attitude. Although I oppose the Bill, I hope he will not draw the conclusion that I am approaching the matter in that way. One can speak only from one's experience, so if I quote my own experience as member for Whyalla it is not because of a parochial attitude but simply because I know the particular circumstances which have arisen in that city and which have a direct relationship to providing finance for this project. I take strong exception to the

Premier's promise of £500,000 being given for the festival hall before the matter was referred to Parliament, and I take particular objection to a sum of this magnitude being offered at a time when we are told that there is considerable Budget stringency.

Mr. Heaslip: That amount was not promised, though.

Mr. LOVEDAY: If one read the *Advertiser* report one could not draw any other conclusion. I think the Adelaide City Council has regarded it as a promise, as it has engaged architects before the matter has been before Parliament. If the honourable member cares to go back to the *Advertiser* report, I am sure he can come to no other conclusion than that it is a firm promise. Everyone else seems to think it is. Apparently he is the only one in step on this matter.

The member for Barossa emphasized that we must not be parochial, and said that Adelaide was the focal point of the State and that we should take a pride in the State. I endorse every word of that. These are particularly significant remarks and a festival hall is badly needed in Adelaide. I am wholly in favour of the construction of a festival hall for the purposes mentioned. However, my objections are, first, to the way in which the Premier has promised this large sum and, secondly, to the fact that this sort of assistance is not available to any other council in the State for any type of hall whatsoever.

I can recall (and I am sure the member for Rocky River can recall) that only two or three years ago I asked the Premier if the Government would give some financial assistance (and I was asking for only a small sum) for the erection of a community hall at Whyalla West whither hundreds of migrants have come every year who have no social amenities and no social meeting place at all. That request was immediately refused. Further, the member for Rocky River asked the Premier whether, in the event of such assistance being granted to Whyalla, he would also grant assistance for, I think, the repair of halls and institutes in country towns. That was to ensure that if Whyalla got assistance all other country towns would get it. I am interested to see whether the member for Rocky River is going to be consistent with his previous attitude on this occasion, and oppose the Bill. I doubt it very much.

Mr. Heaslip: I shall be consistent.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I should point out that my application for assistance was for a city rapidly expanding to the benefit of the State and the

Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. After all, most people living at Whyalla receive salaries and wages which would be similar wherever they were employed, whether at Whyalla or somewhere else. Except for some traders, they do not receive any financial benefit from the large expansion of that city. There is some advantage to them in that a growing city has more amenities, but they do not receive any direct financial advantage. That is received by the State and the B.H.P. However, no assistance whatever was given by the Government to this community for this type of project. The total cost would have been £25,000 or £30,000 at that time. I am not being parochial in the slightest degree. I am quoting this as an instance of the policy followed by the Government in this situation. It is high time the Government was more consistent in granting assistance for these purposes.

I shall outline why this sum is being granted and who should be responsible for financing the hall. If it is right that the council in any country town should be responsible for financing a hall or a project of this nature, then surely in this case it is the responsibility of the people who are so geographically situated that they will be near this festival hall. The people who will live near the hall are the residents of Adelaide and not just the City of Adelaide. In other words, if there is to be consistency, the people financially responsible are those living in Adelaide. If it is good enough for the people in every country town, through their council, to be responsible for the full cost of financing any such comparable project in country towns, then surely it is good enough for the people of Adelaide, not just the City of Adelaide, to be responsible for financing this project. Adelaide is the capital of the State, and we should not lose sight of the fact that over 60 per cent of the population lives there. Adelaide is the centre of wealth, the centre of 60 per cent of the population, yet the other 30 to 40 per cent must contribute but be denied financial assistance toward a comparable project in the country. No Government member can deny that, and that is my firm objection to this Bill. Could the City Council finance this project? Under the Local Government Act (the council works under it the same as any other council) it has the necessary powers. This is virtually admitted in the Bill, because one clause enables the City Council to use these powers. That seems redundant, because the

council already has that power. Why is the clause there? Possibly in an endeavour to save the City Council from protests from rate-payers. I stand to be corrected on that, but one's mind cannot help flowing to this aspect because not only are the sections in the Local Government Act referred to, but clause 3 of the Bill states:

The council may, subject to this Act, construct and provide on land within the City of Adelaide vested in, purchased or otherwise acquired by the council, a festival hall . . . In other words, a special clause gives the City Council specific powers. It seems that it is designed to save the council from any objections that may be raised under the Local Government Act, which could be raised in the ordinary way, but for this Bill, by rate-payers who might object to this project. Why should any council be treated differently in this way? If this project is sound it will proceed. Every council has to run the gauntlet of this sort of thing, so why make special provisions? If the City Council had to finance the project on its own, could it do it? Its assessment is £7,694,760. Under the Local Government Act, a council, if working under a system of annual rental values (as the City Council is), may borrow up to 6s. 6d. in the pound on the assessed value of the ratable property. The City Council could thus borrow, under the Local Government Act, up to £2,500,000. Obviously, there is no financial barrier and the council could do it without Government help.

Mr. Hall: How much would it have borrowed now?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I do not know and I have not inquired. I would not think that it had borrowed much, for the *Advertiser* of June 30 reported:

An estimated Adelaide City Council surplus of £818 was forecast by the Lord Mayor (Mr. Irwin) in his report yesterday to the council meeting on its finances for the municipal year now closing. A credit balance of £193 had been brought forward and the past year had been one of steady achievement within the financial limits contemplated.

No suggestion has been made that this council is hard-pressed by its loan commitments as are so many country councils. This council is obviously well established financially: indeed, it does not even have an overdraft, as have most country councils.

Mr. Millhouse: Surely this is a special project. Doesn't that negate your argument?

Mr. LOVEDAY: It is only special in as much as it is in the city. I dealt with that

aspect and pointed out that it had that special feature; nevertheless, I should be happy about that aspect if we had consistency from the Government in its assistance in that direction in other cases. It was admitted by the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) that country people probably would derive very little direct benefit from this project. In the same way the city people would gain little benefit from going to Whyalla to a hall built there. Then why is there not the same treatment and mental approach to this matter? If it is good enough for one, surely it is good enough for another? The City Council does not appear to be in financial difficulties. It has the assessment and the borrowing powers and, as far as I know, it is in no difficulty regarding loans. The Lord Mayor's report does not indicate the slightest difficulty. In fact, it stated that the receipts were expected to total £1,702,000 for the coming year, an increase of £32,000 over the estimates. I understand that the estimates of the City Council came within about £200 of the actual results—very fine estimating. Most country councils cannot possibly estimate so accurately because of the demands made on them.

Mr. Coumbe: They have fewer parking meters!

Mr. LOVEDAY: There may be something in that. The honourable member for Torrens reminds me of another point—that the City Council has far more avenues for raising revenue than has any country council. It is the oldest local government body in South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: It may have a few more commitments, too.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, and it has a few more citizens as well as many advantages not enjoyed by country councils, yet it receives this special treatment. I have no objection provided we receive similar treatment in the country, but we have not had it and are not getting it. There is nothing parochial about my attitude. It is a matter of principle. The honourable member for Torrens the other day said:

I am sure the member for Whyalla would agree that the civic building in Whyalla is a great advantage to the people there.

Of course it is, but let us see how that was achieved. Before the centre was built the commission had its home in an old billiards hall that it had to buy; previously it occupied a poky little room at the top of the institute building; and prior to that it sat in somebody's office, which was lent to it. That is

how local government bodies have to start in the country. It was considered that the commission needed better offices and a civic centre so that the people could feel that pride in the community about which the member for Barossa talks, and could feel that there was some focal point. The residents said, "You cannot have that unless you make it pay for itself, because we cannot happily visualize the rates rising for this." So the members of the commission got together and said, "Very well; we will design a building that will pay for itself." We had to design a building costing nearly £250,000 for a population of 10,000 to 12,000 people at that time, a building that would pay for itself over 25 to 30 years. That is the only way the building could be achieved. What is more, it had to be placed not in the most favourable position in the city, as is the case with the Adelaide City Council now, but where the centre of business was; otherwise it could not be made to pay.

In other words, the commercial—and not cultural—aspect of it came first. Everything has to be subordinated to the commercial aspect in the case of a country local government body today. Here we are talking about the cultural aspect; money is easily obtained; £500,000 is given and the other £400,000 will be provided by a Government loan at 4½ per cent. No obstacles! Is that being parochial? I think not! All I am asking for is equivalent treatment for country people, and I am utterly opposed to the Bill in its present form. I am sure that this festival hall is needed even though it will mainly be patronized by only a small number of people. I am not under any delusion about that. The cost of attending most functions held in this sort of building is prohibitive to family people.

A man with a family could afford to attend only one or two of the entertainments provided in the last Festival of Arts but, nevertheless, I am not opposed to the Bill on those grounds. This House ought to have a totally different approach to this matter from what I have heard so far. We have heard recently that this or that cannot be effected because of Budget stringency, and the things I have in mind are basic essentials. This festival hall is not a basic essential. As the honourable member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) said, this project comes along when the pioneering stage is past—when people have more leisure and want to broaden their outlook culturally. I agree that that is desirable, but we are seeing basic essentials rejected here today because of Budget stringency. I think the Minister of

Education is looking at his budget and is having to cut out things which are basic essentials and which, to my mind, are far more important than a festival hall at this juncture. I believe that Adelaide is wealthy enough to provide this hall without any financial assistance from the Government and that the City Council has ample powers under the Local Government Act to finance it. It could go ahead with the project any time it wished, and if it wished to get assistance from outside its bare city areas it would be up to the council to make the necessary arrangements. I hope that members will have a good look at this matter along the lines I have suggested. I hope, too, that they will reject this Bill. If this hall is to be built, it can be built in the way that I have suggested. There is nothing to stop its being built and there is no reason for passing this Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I am pleased to support this Bill and I do so knowing that it will provide for South Australia a fine festival hall that will be used by most people of the State at some time or other—and certainly by the people in my district (which extends from an area close to the city for 130 miles). I think that the criticism that the hall will be used by only a few South Australians is not valid. I should imagine that many functions held in this hall will be notable. One that comes to mind is the recent visit to South Australia of the Beatles, and although most people are not Beatle fans I imagine that they would have been prepared to attend this function had it been held in the proposed hall. One can hardly say that all who attended would be young people, but I know that young people from all over the State attended.

I am pleased to see the safeguards in the Bill. Some honourable members have become obsessed with the view that the Adelaide City Council is to be granted this money. Obviously, some authority has to see to the building and control of the hall, and what better body than the City Council? I believe it would be prepared to undertake this responsibility on behalf of the people of the State. I listened with interest to Mr. Casey's remarks, but I disagree with his criticism that the proposed hall will not provide generally for many forms of entertainment.

I believe it is impossible, with the money proposed to be provided, to build a hall that will cater for every interest from concerts to the theatre. In fact, if members read the

press and the opinions expressed in connection with the famous and fabulous opera house in Sydney they will find that it will not cater for as many functions as was thought earlier. The final cost of this opera house is not known. I understand it will be 400 per cent greater than the original estimate. If this is the cost to provide an all-purpose hall, why should we look for an all-purpose hall in Adelaide for only £1,000,000? In trying to achieve everything in design the constructing authority will get into financial trouble, and then we will not get the ultimate design required. If the money were used for a concert hall we would get good value for our money. I am pleased with the steps proposed by the Government. I understand that the festival hall will cater for about 2,000 to 2,500 people. I agree that we should not cater for operatic performances designed to compete with private theatres in this State. In this regard we have the fine Her Majesty's Theatre, which no doubt most honourable members have attended at some time or other.

Mr. Dunstan: We need a concert hall with a very large stage.

Mr. HALL: I cannot tell the honourable member the size of the stage in the proposed building. Perhaps he can do some research on that. The member for Whyalla drew a red herring and went on to say that the Premier had made a promise to supply the money and that, in some mystical way, this would bind Parliament. If the Bill is defeated the Premier will be prevented from granting this money to the Adelaide City Council. I remind honourable members opposite that they have the opportunity to reject this proposition if they wish to do so. In fact, some members opposite have said they oppose it, and they have every right to do so; their voices are heard here and what they say will go on record and in that way it will be known that they opposed the financial provisions of this Bill. I admit that they have not opposed the idea of a festival hall, but they have opposed the present financial arrangements for the building of a hall. I believe that the member for Whyalla is on difficult ground when he says that if we are to have a hall here we must have them everywhere. That is the honourable member's theory, for he said he favours assistance being given in this case only if assistance is extended throughout the State for other halls.

Mr. Loveday: All I am seeking is the same treatment for country areas.

Mr. HALL: Exactly. The honourable member has asked for the same treatment throughout the State, and if that were given it would be many years before this State would be wealthy enough to erect a festival hall like the one now envisaged. Perhaps the honourable member would like to see all the money for roads in this State spent according to the ownership of motor cars within a community, or even the total percentage use they make of the roads in that community.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: About two-thirds of the money for motor vehicle registrations is collected in the metropolitan area.

Mr. HALL: Yes. On figures quoted by the Minister if the same principle applied here it would mean about a two-third reduction in the money spent on country roads. We know that in certain projects one area will seemingly receive an advantage. We also know that in a State-wide consideration of finance we get an evening out of fairness. It would take weeks to calculate who in this State has had a fairer share than someone in another district. This can apply to water rates. If the country makes a loss on water rates paid in relation to the cost of supply and distribution, should the city make up that loss, or should the country pay more to make only as much loss as the city makes? This does not go too well for the member for Whyalla when it is applied to other things. Perhaps the creation of Canberra was a gigantic mistake, for all the money is being spent there and not here. The Commonwealth Parliament has not voted anything to expand the facilities of the State's offices.

Mr. Loveday: Can't you give us a few more accurate analogies than that?

Mr. HALL: I believe that is the principle the honourable member has applied to this matter. His is a completely spurious argument—that the City Council can borrow more money. How does he know that? He does not know the present extent of the City Council's borrowings, nor do I. The honourable member's argument is no good if he cannot say definitely that something is so. His remarks in this respect are pure conjecture and have no relationship to the argument whatsoever.

Mr. Clark: If you are not careful you are going to convert others.

Mr. HALL: The member for Gawler can speak for himself, and I shall be happy to listen to him. I should like to hear the honourable member refute the theme that we cannot have something in one place unless we get the

same benefit in all the State. If that argument were applied to many projects in this State it would limit construction in many instances. It was wrong for the member for Whyalla to mention the opposition of city ratepayers, as that did them a disservice. We should do everything possible to unite ratepayers in projects that will benefit their districts, and in this case it is the whole State. On those grounds I cannot accept the argument of members who oppose the Bill.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the Bill. Although I have the highest regard for the opinions of my colleagues, the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) and the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), I must regretfully differ from them on this occasion. This project is not only for Adelaide or the Adelaide City Council but for the entire State. It is a basic essential if we are to keep pace with trends in the rest of the world. Even some of the lesser developed countries have festival halls. We are endeavouring to attract people here from other parts of the world, so we must provide festival hall facilities.

The Adelaide City Council may be able to meet the cost, but I do not see any reason why it should, as the hall will provide every part of the metropolitan area with ready facilities for culture. It will not be so readily available to country people, but they will not be denied the occasional use of what I hope will be a magnificent hall. I believe the Government is making a grant because the hall will be used for the whole State. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) pointed out that, because of the greater leisure that will be available with a reduction in the working week, these facilities are necessary. I know some members will not agree with me, but I think we must have a shorter working week; possibly we shall have paid unemployment. Are we to say to Adelaide people that they are to be denied this facility because we cannot extend the same facilities to country areas? I do not think that is a reasonable argument.

Mr. Loveday: Do you think the Adelaide City Council is providing for a 35-hour week?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I do not say it is, but I hope it is. I do not subscribe to the attitude that if I cannot have something the other fellow must not have it. That is a wrong attitude to adopt. We all want to take a part in establishing this hall and have a pride in it as South Australians. In other parts of the world people go long distances to attend festival halls; they do not say that because

they live in the country they have no need for them. These halls develop the culture of a nation. This festival hall will be entirely different from the halls that exist in country towns and the metropolitan area: it is to serve another purpose. The difficulties the member for Whyalla has seen in his rapidly developing district have been experienced in every metropolitan area in Australia. I remember that the construction of the town hall at Hindmarsh was commenced in the depression. At that time Hindmarsh had nothing that was satisfactory as a hall: it was in the same position as Whyalla is now. We could not afford to build a hall at Hindmarsh in the area with the best surroundings, but had to build it elsewhere and enter into an arrangement to let it to Clifford's on a 30-year lease, which paid for the building.

Mr. Jennings: It could go to Tom the Cheap now!

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am glad to see that when one door closes another opens. That would be some good that Tom the Cheap would do, if no other. I believe the principle of the Bill is good and its objectives are excellent. It is desirable to have a festival hall and I should think that in their calmer moments members who oppose the Bill may regret it. I wish to refer to an aspect raised by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) and I hope that he will not seek to amend clause 4. The Adelaide City Council, with its experience, could quite effectively manage and control this hall in the interests of the State. Although there may be a more opportune time to say this, I think that if the member for Adelaide examines the proposals he may realize that the Liberal Party has a majority on the management committee and the rooms may be reserved for them. However, I hope that he will not proceed with his foreshadowed amendment. I give my wholehearted support to the Bill. It will do much for the culture of South Australia and when, and if, it is completed South Australians will be proud of this accomplishment.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill. I join with most Opposition members who have spoken in saying that I bitterly resent the contemptuous way in which the Premier treats Parliament by publicly announcing State expenditure on matters of this kind. Unfortunately, through some misunderstanding between the Chair and the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) last night, he was frequently called to order for making irrelevant remarks.

I shall now say something similar, but I can make my complaint about similar matters much more relevant because, only recently, a report appeared in the *Advertiser* (this is relevant to festivals of some kind) to the effect that the Premier went to a function at Tandunda, walked down from the "gods", was cheered by the multitude, and announced that the Government—not the Parliament (it is never the Parliament)—would give £1,000 for choral competitions in South Australia.

Mr. Loveday: In true Olympian fashion.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but I don't know whether the Premier had his toga on.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You are getting smart.

Mr. JENNINGS: I hasten to disagree with one of the last remarks of my colleague, the member for Hindmarsh, when he said that the control of this hall is best served by vesting it in the Adelaide City Council. I certainly do not agree with that. If the Parliament of this State grants such a large sum it should have a fair say in the way that money is handled. I have a further objection to remarks made by the member for Whyalla. He claimed, as did the member for Frome, that this hall is for Adelaide only. It is not. We know, and I think it is reasonable to assume that, generally, there will be more people from Adelaide patronising it than people from rural areas. That is inevitable because of the population, the geography, and the situation of the hall. After all, Adelaide is the capital city and we cannot have capital cities all over the State. Likewise, we cannot have test matches at every cricket ground in the State, and we cannot have the Australian rules grand final played at every football oval in the State. There has to be a capital city and this hall should be situated in that city.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. JENNINGS: I support the Bill, which is to be referred to a Select Committee, and I shall await with interest the committee's report.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the Bill with a great deal of pleasure. I have been pleased to see the almost general support for the measure, and express surprise that there could be some opposition to it. A festival hall will have the further purpose of drawing people to South Australia, particularly at the time of our Festival of Arts, which in the past few years has been

so successful and which has led to a clamour for the building now envisaged. As South Australians we should be proud that a building of this magnitude is being considered, and it is hoped it will be ready, not for the next festival, but for the one afterwards. Some members have said that many country people will not have the opportunity to participate in the various entertainments at this hall, but even if they do not have this opportunity, at least many hundreds of children of country parents will have it, because many come to the city for their education and go further with tertiary education, whether at the university or at the Institute of Technology. I am sure no-one would deny that the child of today is much more advanced in matters of culture, such as music, theatre and ballet, than we were in our day. These are the extra-curricula activities provided for the children attending our public schools today.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the Beatles?

Mrs. STEELE: You can take your choice, of course. They will almost reach the stage when they will be accepted as people of culture in their own right. I think this is a point that we rather tend to overlook.

Another thought that occurs to me is that today the Australian Broadcasting Commission is probably the medium that has done more to foster interest in music, theatre and things of this nature than any other organization of its size elsewhere, because it has brought to Australia so many world-famous artists and orchestras. Not only does it provide this kind of entertainment for people in the cities but also there is an increasing willingness on the part of the A.B.C. to send its orchestras and guest artists into country districts to give recitals. I am associated with the A.B.C. in a number of different ways and I know that these tours that are being arranged are increasing in number so that, even if country people do not always have an opportunity to come to the cities to hear good music, it is taken to them and that fosters in them a desire so that, when particularly good orchestras or artists come to the city, these people make a special effort to attend. This is the whole purpose of fostering interest in culture, and perhaps music in particular. Every great artist who has been to Australia has commented on the wonderful acoustics of the Adelaide Town Hall as a small music hall. Those of us who are interested in music are all aware of this. I envisage that the town hall will still be used for that purpose although, if we have a

festival hall, we will be able to cater for greater numbers at each concert than we can cater for at the moment when even one concert in a series in an orchestral season has to be performed on three separate nights.

Another point is that, as a people, we are reluctant to devote any public moneys to the provision of these kinds of cultural facility, or in fact of any form of building that will afford opportunities for recreation in the increased leisure time that people enjoy today. As soon as fountains were suggested for the city there was an outburst of criticism about wasting funds in putting up fountains to mark the visits of various people to this State. In my own district of Burnside, for instance, I can well remember the opposition there was to the building of a ballroom that could be used for the recreation of young and old alike. I remember more recently the fuss from a certain section of the community when the Burnside library was built.

Mr. Millhouse: You have not forgotten the swimming pool!

Mrs. STEELE: I couldn't! There was opposition to the Burnside library, yet it has proved to be one of the most successful libraries in the metropolitan area. In the first month of its existence more than 7,000 books were borrowed—an outstanding record. Then, more recently, we have had the arguments about a swimming pool.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: And before that there was intense opposition to the building of a hall in the civic chambers at Burnside.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, the main town hall. It is extraordinary that this should happen in a district of the metropolitan area where the people have perhaps more leisure time to give to these things than people in some other districts have, and perhaps have more money with which they could endow some of these buildings. We had this great opposition to the swimming pool and to any public moneys being spent on a facility that would give leisure and recreation particularly to the young people in the district. Of course, in the older cities of Europe there are many fine public buildings, art galleries, museums, opera houses and libraries that were all built in days when people had more money with which to endow such buildings, and were more able to provide the kinds of facility that we now envisage providing for the people of this State. People cannot always be expected these days to subscribe to the erection of cultural buildings, at least not as they used to in the past, because of high taxation and prohibitive costs.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I think the New South Wales Government has found that out.

Mrs. STEELE: I am glad some check has been placed on the sum to be spent here. The very fact that these days we have shorter working hours and more aids to industry means that people have more leisure, and we should be encouraging them to spend this time in a worthwhile way. The provision of a festival hall is one way this can be achieved. The Government should give the lead to develop this kind of cultural centre. It is most heartening to see the almost general support for the financial arrangements necessary to establish a festival hall as Adelaide's cultural centre, and I have much pleasure, therefore, in supporting the Bill.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I oppose the Bill and at the outset say that I appreciate the remarks of the member who has just resumed her seat. However, I suggest to her that

country people have the same aspirations, the same love for music, and the same appreciation of culture, as people living in the metropolitan area. When the symphony orchestra visits country districts the percentage of the population that attends its concerts is far greater than the percentage of the metropolitan population attending such concerts in the city. The fact that I am opposing this measure does not mean that country people lack appreciation of culture or the belief that advancement of culture is necessary for the full expression of life.

Mrs. Steele: I never suggested that.

Mr. RICHES: I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 1, at 2 p.m.