

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 14, 1958.

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

QUESTIONS.**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ROLLS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—As the latest print of the Legislative Council rolls for the various districts is made up to February 6, 1956, will the Government see that a reprint is made as early as possible to assist in checking whether eligible persons are enrolled or not, for the State elections will be held early next year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will direct the question to the Chief Secretary. Of course, it will be necessary for the roll to be ready for the State elections to be held early next year, but I am not sure whether it is now advisable to reprint the roll and then issue a supplementary roll immediately before the elections. I think that is the usual procedure.

Mr. O'Halloran—It has been in the past.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will attend to the matter and advise the Leader in a couple of days what can be done.

FOOT ROT IN SHEEP.

Mr. HARDING—Yesterday I drew the Minister of Agriculture's attention to an item in yesterday's *News* headed "Foot rot can be cured." It stated:—

Melbourne, Today: An announcement that foot rot could now be completely cured was made at Minyip yesterday by Australian Wheat Board member, Mr. C. Everett.

Can the Minister comment on that item?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I saw the article and viewed it with some scepticism, although there is no doubt that foot rot can be cured, but I was rather sceptical about the fact that it can be cured just by the application of a substance. I asked the Chief Inspector of Stock to examine the article, and he has given me this report:—

As we have no information on the formula of the preparation, a definite statement cannot be made. However, as the treatment for "thrush" depended on the use of corrosive substances such as antimony trichloride, it is most probable that the "cure" mentioned is of a similar nature.

According to the newspaper article, the person claiming this cure said that the substance had been used in the treatment of thrush as far

back as 1912. The Chief Inspector's report continues:—

There are several similar preparations already registered under the Stock Medicines Act for the treatment of footrot. They are of very limited use, and are not recommended by this department. With adequate paring in dry weather, almost any substance will apparently cure footrot. The only proof of efficiency is what happens when the flock is subjected to prolonged wet conditions. Without adequate controls, laboratory examination of smears from suspect infected feet, and the opportunity for relapses to occur, no assessment can be made of the efficiency of any preparation.

HANSARDS FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Members of Parliament are allowed a very limited number of *Hansards* and in view of the ever-increasing numbers of schools being erected in some members' districts it is most difficult to supply sufficient *Hansards* to send to the schools unless members pay for them. Will the Minister of Education consider whether it would be possible to make available at least one copy of *Hansard* to each school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be very pleased to consider the matter. In the first place, I do not know whether it is necessary or desirable to distribute them to all the schools—there are nearly 750 of them—but, perhaps as an experiment, it would be wise to distribute them to all the secondary schools. I should be quite prepared to do that at the cost of the Education Department if there is no other source of supply because I consider that students in secondary schools and those engaged in civic courses and other social studies are much better informed and far more interested in public affairs and community activities than are ordinary everyday adults.

BULK HANDLING AT THEVENARD.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding bulk handling facilities at Thevenard?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Investigations into this matter have been concluded and provision is being sought on the Estimates for an amount to proceed with the project and, dependent on the passage of the Estimates and the conclusions of Cabinet thereon, the matter will receive consideration. I think I can assure the honourable member that he has very good reason to hope that some progress will be made in this work this financial year.

COUNTRY ENGINEERING WORKS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Recently I asked a question in the House regarding an engineering firm at Whyalla, but from the remarks of one member in the House yesterday there may be some misunderstanding in the matter. The firm in question can obtain steel cheaper than some of its competitors elsewhere, particularly when obtained direct from Newcastle. Its overhead is very low, and it has supplied eight or nine large prefabricated steel pontoons for the Harbors Board in competition with other engineering firms in the State, despite the cost of transport of the finished product from Whyalla to Adelaide. It has recently carried out a large order for rollingstock for the Commonwealth Railways. My previous reference to the importance of the size of the work for which tenders are called by the Supply and Tender Board referred to the fact that many jobs advertised can be handled only by large civil engineering firms which sublet fabrication and engineering work to smaller firms, and apparently this firm has been unable to get any of this work. Will the Minister of Works consider these points fully before giving me a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. Since the honourable member asked his first question I have had a talk with the Supply and Tender Board on the position. The position regarding all Government work is that open tenders are called. It is the regular practice of the board to advertise every Monday morning in the *Advertiser* all work for which tenders are open at that time; consequently, all persons interested have access to the information on the same day. There are, of course, much smaller jobs which are open for offers and it has been the practice of the board to inform firms that have asked for the information that certain offers are being sought. That is of benefit to both parties, because the industries are informed that the work is open to offer and the board has the advantage of a wider range of tenders. If this particular firm has not already done so, I suggest it communicate with the board intimating its interest in these matters. So far as it is able—and it cannot make any guarantee—the board informs all interested persons as a matter of courtesy. I suggest that this firm also study the weekly advertisements in the press. The board hopes to be able to adjust its contracts to enable industries of smaller capacity to tender for works. Since the honourable member raised this matter I have had one or two inquiries from other industries in country towns similarly situated, and I am anxious that every

opportunity should be given to all to offer or tender for Government work.

WEAPONS RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—On Tuesday I asked the Premier whether he would consider suspending the sitting of this House on August 21 to enable members to attend a preview of the Weapons Range Establishment. Has he done so?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The Government will be pleased to facilitate such an inspection by members. This State has every right to be proud of the Weapons Research Establishment which I do not think can be reproduced in any other part of the world. Members should have an opportunity of seeing first-hand what is being accomplished. Under the circumstances the House will not sit at all next Thursday. I understand the inspection was timed for between 2 and 4 p.m. and as Gawler is, for some members, half way home, it would be absurd to bring them back for an hour's sitting. I had intended to bring down the Loan Estimates on Thursday, but with the assistance of the House it may be possible to do so on Wednesday evening. In any event, members can accept the invitation.

FISHING IN RESERVOIRS.

Mr. DUNSTAN—My colleague, the member for Edwardstown, asked a question last week about fishing in reservoirs. I understand from the Piscatorial Council, with which I have some association, that the request made for limited fishing in reservoirs bore no relation to fishing under the circumstances or in the places mentioned by the Minister in his reply. Would the Minister of Works table the request made by the fishermen to show exactly what the request was, and also the report of the Advisory Committee on Water Supply Examination which I understand was called for by the Premier when he was originally negotiating on this subject?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have examined the matter again. On looking through the docket this morning I found that the Advisory Committee on Water Supply Examination had had this matter referred to it, but so far as I could discover, had not made a report. I have now referred the matter to it again and asked it to investigate and give me a full report.

BEAUTIFICATION OF HIGHWAYS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Tree-lined highways are always things of beauty and have the added advantage of affording desirable windbreaks in

country areas. I can envisage the Main North Road which is now being widened, as one of our loveliest drives if it were given the character of a tree-lined avenue. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Roads say whether consideration will be given to planting trees on this and other highways as part of a general policy in the interests of beautification, and also from the point of view of utility value in preventing wind erosion in country areas?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will bring the matter to the notice of the Minister of Roads.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR STOLEN TOOLS.

Mr. TAPPING—Recently a complaint was made to me that three apprentices working for a city firm each had tools valued at £59 stolen one night. They approached the manager for reimbursement, but were refused, and told that as the tools belonged to them they were obliged to stand the loss. I am glad to say that the firm made a rebate of half the cost to two of the boys, but I think it is wrong that they had to sustain any loss. I do not blame the firm, because apparently there is some weakness in the Act. Would the Minister of Education refer this matter to the Minister of Industry to see if some legislation might be brought down whereby apprentices would be safeguarded against such losses?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes, I would be pleased to discuss the matter with my colleague, and with Mr. J. S. Walker, who is Chairman of the Apprentices Board, Superintendent of Technical Schools, and at present the Acting Deputy Director of Education, and who is very well informed on the whole matter of apprenticeship.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ASSISTANCE.

Mr. RICHES—On August 6 the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) asked the Minister of Works for information concerning the assistance the Government would be prepared to give to establish an industry in a country district. Amongst other things, the Minister is reported to have said in his reply:—

Subject of course to investigations by the Industries Development Committee, or similar investigations, the Government is prepared to provide finance.

The policy that has been followed over the last two or three years has been that the industry must arrange its own finance, and that the Government assists by giving guarantees. I believe that some applicants have not been able to obtain finance through the banks and as a result have been rejected

by the Government. Would the Minister of Works inform me whether any sum is now available to the Government under the appropriate Act to establish industries in the country, and if so, the amount?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think the position is that any industries whose requests have been refused have not been refused on the ground that there is inadequate finance available, but they have probably been considered ineligible for some other reason. I am unable to give any definite figures of the amount available, but a number of industries have been assisted, there being two methods of assistance—by means of a guarantee, or by providing finance as a straight out loan.

Mr. RICHES—Do you know of any?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes, and if the honourable member will listen to my speech on the Address in Reply I will give him further information on the matter. Although I am speaking from memory and therefore subject to correction I think at least five were given straight out loans. It is quite correct to say that industries have been financed through both means. The amount of money available would depend on the number of applications received, and of course ultimately, if a great number were received, the resources available to finance them; but, so far as I am aware, it has never occurred that an industry has been declined assistance by way of either loan or guarantee because of the inability of the Government or financial institutions to provide for them.

BOOKS IN PRISON LIBRARIES.

Mr. HUGHES—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked about the types of literature in prison libraries?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Chief Secretary has furnished me with a fairly long report on this matter which I am prepared to make available to the honourable member, but the gist of it is that the library at Yatala Labour Prison comprises approximately 4,000 volumes. There is a comprehensive range of all types of books and selected magazines, which are catalogued under the general headings of:—

	Books.
General fiction	2,266
Educational	503
Magazines	450
Western	250
Mystery	70
Theology and religion	126
Poetry	101
History	109
Languages (various)	54
Travel	146
Biographical and philosophical	304

In proportion to all other types of literature, "Western" and "Mystery" books approximate some 7 per cent of available reading matter. If my colleague the Minister of Education does not mind, as a matter of interest I should like to refer also to an extract from an article in the *News* of the 12th August. It is as follows:—

Yatala men do well in examinations. More than 100 convicts at Yatala and Gladstone prisons are now swotting to good purpose.

Then follows an interesting account of the successes achieved by prisoners in public examinations. I suggest that it would be helpful to the honourable member to get a complete picture of the activities of these people if he studied this article, which goes on to say that, through the excellent co-operation given by the Public Library's country lending service and other agencies, large numbers of prisoners have taken an interest in furthering their education to very good purpose.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It has been recently suggested to me that no copies of the Holy Bible are at present available to prisoners at Yatala or the Adelaide Gaol, although I do not know whether that is so. If it is, I suggest that the Bible should be available to any prisoner wishing to read it because, even though only one in a hundred may wish to do so, he should have the opportunity. In his reply to Mr. Hughes, the Minister did not refer specifically to the Bible, although he referred to theological works. Can he say whether the Bible is available to prisoners and, if it is not, will he arrange with the Chief Secretary to have copies made available?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the honourable member's remarks to the Chief Secretary.

ROADMAKING EQUIPMENT FOR COUNCILS.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The substance of my question is to be found in my speech on the Address in Reply. It refers to the high rates paid by district councils to the Highways Department for the use of roadmaking equipment. I pointed out several anomalies. I should like the Minister of Works to ascertain for me the reaction of the Minister of Roads and his department towards removing the anomalies and charging the same rate to district councils and interested bodies.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am sure that my colleague's staff will draw his attention to

the remarks of the honourable member in his speech on the Address in Reply; but, to make sure that that is done, I personally will bring it to his notice.

MOSQUITO CREEK FLOODING.

Mr. HARDING—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week relative to the cause of water in Mosquito Creek flooding northwards into Bool Lagoon?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Following the honourable member's question, I had a letter sent to the Superintendent of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, to which he replied by telegram as follows:—

Flood conditions Struan area normal. Water following natural courses northward. Diversion to Bool Lagoon requires extensive excavation as planned. Report following—Lister.

Later, I received the following report from the chairman of the South Eastern Drainage Board (Mr. W. M. Anderson):—

The following is submitted in regard to the question of Mr. L. C. Harding, M.P., in the House of Assembly as to the cause of water flowing northwards away from the original outlet into Bool Lagoon. The flow of water from Mosquito Creek northwards around Bool Lagoon when the creek is in flood is a natural condition. The creek flows through the range at Struan and the water spreads when it reaches the plains. Only part of the water reaches Bool Lagoon, the remainder flowing in a north-westerly direction across the plains. Following heavy rains that have fallen, the Mosquito Creek has been flowing strongly and areas east and north of Bool Lagoon are becoming inundated. These conditions are, however, to be expected in view of the intensity of the rain which has been well above average in many places. It has long been recognised that the control of the Mosquito Creek floodwaters is a pre-requisite to the drainage of this area. The scheme for the drainage of the Eastern Division of the South-East, which was recently investigated and recommended by the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee provides for the control of the creek and for its diversion with other floodwaters to the sea *via* an outlet at Beachport.

SUBSIDIES FOR LIBRARIES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Can the Minister of Education say how many libraries at present operating in South Australia receive subsidies under the Libraries Subsidies Act?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I prefer not to answer that question at present, for I would like to be precise. I will let the honourable member have information on it next Tuesday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: POLICE ACTION AGAINST NEW AUSTRALIANS.

Mr. SHANNON—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. SHANNON—On August 5, as a result of complaints to me, I asked a question concerning police administration of the “move on” section of the Police Offences Act. I have communicated with Superintendent Grow, who was good enough to send a senior officer of his department to interview the parents of the boy concerned in this incident, and I can now inform the House that I am perfectly satisfied that the department acted properly. The police officers were out to prevent this boy from keeping bad company, which was one of the reasons for his apprehension. His parents are not only happy about the situation, but are urging the police to persist in ensuring that their boy does not mix with undesirable persons. It is only fair to the department to make this explanation. I do not imply that my informant was incorrectly informed, but I think the circumstances of the case justified the police action.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 13. Page 378.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—At the outset I express my sympathy to the widow and other relatives of the late John Fletcher, a man whom all members liked. I congratulate those members who have been elevated to various positions, and with considerable pleasure I welcome the new member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston). From my knowledge of Mount Gambier, gained during the recent by-election campaign, I confidently predict that his stay here will be long and his record of service creditable to himself and valuable to the district.

Normally in their Address in Reply speeches members address themselves to matters that are constructive, criticize Government policy, and suggest alterations either in policy or administration. That is the course I have always tried to follow, for I believe that is the purpose of this debate: it is an opportunity for members to raise matters of policy and administration that they think important to this State. Today, however, I will depart from that policy at the outset, not because I think that normally it is necessary to spend the time of the House on other matters, but because of certain remarks made by members

opposite which I do not think were in the best interests of the House, the members concerned, or the State; and I do not propose to let them go unanswered.

The first matter to which I shall refer is the fact that during the course of this debate certain members opposite have seen fit to attribute to members on this side remarks and views not expressed by them. These allegations have been made and justly resented by members on this side, including me. This sort of thing should not go on in this House and, when allegations are made concerning the remarks or views of members, the words used by those members should be quoted so that they may be accurately represented, both to this House and the general public of the State. Twice in this debate, however, that was not done in respect of my views: members opposite attributed to me views I did not possess and remarks I had not expressed. Let me turn first of all to the member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke).

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—You are going to deny that you believe in unification?

Mr. DUNSTAN—The honourable member will hear what I said previously and what I say now and, if he is concerned for truth, honesty and sincerity in this House and in South Australia, he will be a little quieter today and not repeat what he said earlier in this debate. I shall quote what the honourable member said, because I do not want to do to him what he tried to do to me. He said:—

There was also a reference to Labor's attitude on unification or centralization. Mr. John Clark properly rejected the idea of Federal control of education although at the same time making a claim for additional financial assistance. He at least amongst the Opposition is aware of the dangers of a centralized form of government, yet on several occasions Mr. Dunstan has in this House said “Unification is Labor's policy.” Is unification Labor's policy?

I interjected, “Unification of sovereign power, but decentralization of administration.” The honourable member continued:—

The honourable member has assured the House in the past, without any mental reservation or equivocation whatsoever, that unification is Labor's policy.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Is it Labor's policy?

Mr. DUNSTAN—If the honourable member waits a moment he will hear. Let him keep quiet instead of trying to heckle.

Mr. Heaslip—Can't you take it?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. I want to tell the honourable member what the Party's policy is, and I repeat what I said previously.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—I want you to say yes or no.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I do not intend to say yes or no to a question like “Have you stopped beating your wife?” I interjected, “I have never said it outright in those words and I give the honourable member the lie direct. Quote my words.” He did not do so, but said it could all be found in *Hansard*. In a moment I will find it in *Hansard* for him. He again made the allegation that I said unification is Labor’s policy. I asked him to quote my words but he did not do so. Today he suggests that we want to unify everything in Australia. That is not what I said in the past. I will quote what I said on this subject so that the honourable will not be able to put glosses on my words.

Mr. Dunnage—It is not what you say but what your Party says.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I will tell the honourable member what the Party says.

Mr. Dunnage—You have to do as you are told, so what does it matter?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER—Order! I ask members on both sides to refrain from interjecting. The Chair is unable to hear the member for Norwood, who has the floor, because there are so many interjections.

Mr. DUNSTAN—On September 19, 1956, speaking on a motion dealing with the Federal Constitution, I said:—

I believe that ultimately effective unification will be forced upon the Australian people with some form of decentralized local government, subordinate legislatures to bring the Government as close as possible to the people.

Mr. Dunnage—That is what you believe, not the Trades Hall.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I will tell the honourable member what the Trades Hall believes.

Mr. Dunnage—You have to do as you are told.

The SPEAKER—Order! I ask the honourable member for Unley to cease interjecting.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Let me give the honourable member some more of what I said. Obviously he does not want to listen. I said:—

In an emergency how in the world could effective economic measures be taken when there were seven different State taxing powers. We have the greatest degree of centralization possible in a city but we would get far greater decentralization if we had subordinate legislatures much closer to the people than this Parliament.

Mr. Dunnage—What, the Trades Hall?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am not the only member on this side who has had something to say on this subject. Mr. Jennings also used words to the same effect when he said:—

I believe that the proper constitution for Australia would be a single chamber national Parliament with sovereign powers, delegated powers to regional authorities, and not the States as we know them now, because surely everyone must agree that the States are not scientifically drawn up but are just lines on the map. If we had regional authorities drawing powers from the sovereign Parliament we could have those regions arranged in a way in which there would be general community interest of the people in them.

Additional States would be created, and they would have subordinate legislatures with delegated powers.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Unification in law, you mean?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I mean unification of sovereign powers, in which every member on this side of this House believes. Every member wants effective government of Australia but if there were regional powers in State legislatures with delegated authority it would be nearer the people than this Parliament or the one at Canberra.

Mr. Heaslip—That would be centralization.

Mr. DUNSTAN—It would be far more decentralized than what we have now. In respect of many matters the Governments of Australia cannot govern at all. Let me quote what Mr. Jennings said on another occasion:—

I do not believe in the present Federal system that gives sovereign power to the State Parliaments and only delegated powers to the Federal Parliament. I believe the Federal Government should have the sovereign powers and that it should delegate power to the States.

Mr. Dunnage—While Bob Menzies is there?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. I would vote in favour of it immediately. As the honourable member talks about the Trades Hall telling us what to do, let me tell him something about that matter. I have a copy of the Australian Labor Party policy.

Mr. Dunnage—Where can we get a copy?

Mr. DUNSTAN—At the Trades Hall.

Mr. Dunnage—You can, but what about us?

Mr. DUNSTAN—On many occasions the Leader of the Opposition has given members opposite autographed copies of our policy. If the honourable member wants me to do so I will pass a copy over to all members on his side.

Mr. Dunnage—Would you put one in the library?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. This is what the Australian Labor Party policy says:—

Amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers and the duty and authority to create States possessing delegated constitutional powers.

That is completely consistent with what members on this side have said on this subject, and Mr. Calwell has said it. We believe in additional States. We believe in having all local government much closer to the people than it is now.

Mr. Coumbe—If you had a centralized Government do you think it would delegate to the States.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Our policy is to do that because we do not believe for one moment that a Government can be effective in Australian when it is divorced from the people. If we made Canberra the sole source of all administration the situation would be hopeless.

Mr. Millhouse—Into how many regions do you envisage Australia divided?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I imagine not more than 20.

Mr. Millhouse—How many for South Australia?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I cannot tell the honourable member exactly.

Mr. Millhouse—You are theorizing all the time.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Do you imagine that without a Royal Commission we could draw lines immediately as to where the regional boundaries should be? Obviously it entails much evidence and a Royal Commission would have to be appointed.

Mr. Millhouse—Can you answer my question?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I will tell the honourable member more about it in a moment. Mr. John Clark's name has been brought into the debate in the usual way to try to make divisions when there are no divisions at all. He agrees with everything I have said on the subject this afternoon.

Mr. Dunnage—Mr. Clyde Cameron agrees with all that. Look what is happening to him!

Mr. DUNSTAN—Nothing is happening to him. He is the President of the South Australian Labor Party and has solid support from the Party because we consider him a light and an adornment to the Party. There are some views which have been expressed on this subject that will undoubtedly interest members opposite. They were expressed by Mr. E. G.

Whitlam, M.H.R., a prominent and able member of the Federal Labor Party, in the Chifley Memorial Lecture delivered last year. Speaking on the Constitution and the Labor Party he said:—

There are few functions which the State Parliaments now perform which would not be better performed by the Australian Parliament or by regional councils. The States are too large to deal with local matters and too small and weak to deal with national ones. Three-quarters of the Acts which each State Parliament passes are repetitions of the Acts which every other State Parliament passes. The same applies to regulations gazetted by each State Government. Most of this legislation does not refer to local matters, but to matters which are the same from one end of Australia to the other. There is a different traffic code in each State and Territory.

It is fantastic that courts in South Australia have found that a motorist can travel over a highway in this State at 60 miles an hour as a reasonable speed, but under a different code in Victoria he is called a road hog when he crosses the border and is hauled before the courts and has all sorts of things said about him. Mr. Whitlam continued:—

There are different laws relating to pure foods and poisons. A man who lives in Queanbeyan and who is injured on his way to or from work in Canberra or a man who lives in Wodonga and is injured on his way to or from his work in Albury has different rights to damages or compensation, according to the side of the border on which he receives his injury. Seamen are covered by a State Workers' Compensation Act if their ports of departure and destination are within the one State, by a Commonwealth Act if those ports are in different States and by another Commonwealth Act if they are employed on one of the ships of the Australian Coastal Shipping Commission. The present State boundaries were imposed on Australians a century ago from Westminster. There is no economic reason for preserving them. They merely serve to maintain the domination of the commercial and political interests which are centred in the State capitals.

We heard yesterday from the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) that this matter did not concern him, but I assure him that it certainly concerns members on this side of the House that this State should be politically dominated by interests in this city instead of by those spread throughout the State.

Mr. Heaslip—Do you support the views you are reading?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Of course I do.

Mr. Heaslip—Do you believe in the abolition of State Parliaments?

Mr. DUNSTAN—It is useless trying to explain things to the honourable member.

Obviously, he is incapable of understanding the simplest proposition.

Mr. Millhouse—Would you rather have this State dominated by interests in Adelaide or by interests in Canberra?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I do not think the honourable member has put forward the essential alternative. I believe that our administration in this State should be much closer to the people and based upon regional interests, and that local government in this State, as it is kept to ditch digging and drain making and little more, is not as effective as it should be, and that instead of our present States system, which centralizes political and civic interests in State capital cities, we should have delegated legislatures in Australia much closer to the people and based solely upon regional interests. Further, they should be based upon a democratic franchise, and anyone who contends for a moment that the present State boundaries have anything logical about them is suffering from the strangest of political delusions.

Mr. Millhouse—What do you mean by the term “closer to the people” that you are frequently using?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Closer in distance for one thing. I do not know how often the honourable member dashes off into the country to address local political meetings. I do it fairly often, and I assure members opposite that those on this side of the House are often required by people in country areas to go out and tell them about various political matters. It is much easier to give effective representation if one is not 300 miles from his constituents. It is absurd to have a system not based upon regional interests but dividing the essentially regional interests of, say, Mount Gambier from the agricultural and commercial interests that surround it. That district is represented here by a member, whereas there could be a regional council in that area much closer to the people in distance and associated with other areas which today, as a result of State boundaries, are split from Mount Gambier but which have common interests.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Would these regional councils have lawmaking powers?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. I said we would have delegated legislatures, and that is what those words mean.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The councils would have lawmaking powers?

Mr. DUNSTAN—How can there be any legislature that does not have such powers?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—These regional authorities would be what?

Mr. DUNSTAN—They would be on similar lines to English county governments, but much larger.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—You would have a greater variety of government.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Certainly, and it would be much more effective because government in Australia could work then and the people's interests could be immediately considered.

Mr. Jennings—Do you think that is what members opposite would want?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I do not think so because they are not interested in giving effective voice to the people. That is evident from the electoral system in this State, and also from the fact that members opposite persist in believing in a Federal system which divides powers and prevents either of the quasi-sovereign legislatures in Australia from having powers over many matters upon which it is essential that some government in Australia should make laws for the good of this country.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—I do not think you have discussed this very fully with members of your Party.

Mr. DUNSTAN—This matter has been discussed continuously and fully within the Australian Labor Party and is well understood by its members. It is not a new policy: it has been on the Party platform for more than 30 years.

I have been accused in this House of having repudiated my Leader. This accusation had not the slightest justification and was not based on truth. Earlier this session my Leader raised the question of the control of meat prices. In his view, and I may add in mine, the position was that meat was not in short supply, but owing to the position which existed under meat marketing here price control was not doing what it was designed to do in respect of that commodity only, and Mr. O'Halloran asked the Premier to consider decontrolling it. The member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) then asked the Premier whether, in view of Mr. O'Halloran's remarks, he would decontrol all commodities. That is not what my Leader asked for. He does not believe in it, nor do I. It was reported in the press that the question came from me. I disclaimed this and said it was the view of the honourable member for Unley. The extraordinary thing is that the honourable member said that my views on this subject were different from those of my Leader. There was not a scintilla of

evidence to warrant that remark. When such things are said and an honourable member is represented in a light which cannot bear honest or sincere examination, he is entitled to get more than a little annoyed about it.

Mr. Heaslip—You agree that price control does not work in practice?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I did not say that at all, and I do not believe it. I believe in the maintenance of price control. However, I am sorry that control in this State is not doing what it should. I have always been an advocate of Federal price control, because that type of control can be operated with a system of subsidies, which makes it much more effective. It was honourable members opposite who in the 1948 referendum campaign said that price control could be effectively administered by the States. The Premier said that from one end of South Australia to the other but it was not true. I hope the placing of improper constructions upon an honourable member's words in this House will cease. It is about time that that kind of thing was eschewed. I do not try to mislead members in the House, and I trust no other honourable member will do so either.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) stated that the Australian Labor Party was divided. I was very interested in that comment, because it seemed strange coming from a member of the Liberal Party. I examined the situation as it applied to the Liberal and Country Parties in Australia, and find it a most extraordinary one. In Victoria, the Liberal and Country Parties are divorced—indeed, they carry on a kind of acrimonious bickering. The Party led by Sir Herbert Hyland does strange things on occasions. On one occasion Sir Herbert said that that genius, Mr. Bolte, was a mongrel, an expression which normally would meet with considerable objection. I cannot conceive that honourable members opposite believe that a peace exists between the Liberal and the Country Parties in Victoria. What was the position before? The Liberal Party was split wide open. The last of the rebels has just been defeated with the help of the official Liberal Party's ally. What has happened to Mr. Hollway who believed in the rights of the people of Victoria to one vote one value against the interests of the Liberal Party but in the interests of the people of the whole State? He said that every man in the State should have an equal vote, and he was tossed out from the Liberal Party. He wanted to come back, saying, "I believe basically in the Liberal Party's economic

policy," but when he and his supporters knocked on the door of the Liberal Party it was closed in their faces. We have heard gibes from the other side of the House about members of my Party being directed and not being allowed to do what they want to and so on. What about Mr. Hollway, and what happened to Sir Clifden Eager?

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—What about Mr. Chambers?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I will come to him in a moment. I realize why the honourable member wants to distract members' attention from the situation in the Victorian Liberal Party. Let us move from Victoria to Western Australia. What is the situation there between the Liberal and the Country Parties? According to Mr. Coumbe, they are united and glorious Parties which got together for the good of the State, whereas here we are a disunited rabble. The facts are that in Western Australia there has been bickering between the Liberal and Country Parties. Not only was there the position regarding Senator Agnes Robertson, but recently the Leader of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council defected in a hurry to the Country Party.

Mr. John Clark—I don't blame him.

Mr. DUNSTAN—We didn't hear much about that here, although there was a good deal of fuss about it in Western Australia. When there is no division in the Labor ranks some organs of the press in Australia try to manufacture one, but we hear little regarding trouble in the Party of members opposite. The press will often say about the Labor Party, that an attack is being made on so and so, or it is believed there is a division of opinion of this or that kind, without having any basis whatever for saying so. It does happen all the same. What about Queensland? In Queensland anything but a happy situation exists.

Mr. Coumbe—Who is Mr. Gair?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I was discussing the Liberal and Country Party. I am giving members full information about this united and glorious Party. In Queensland the Liberal and Country Parties have been at daggers drawn for some time. Just recently, with a term of office in front of them, they got together for about the first time in their history, but on present indications this is not going to last long. In New South Wales the Country Party has continuously refused to enter into a practicable and working arrangement with the Liberal Party. They dislike each other and call each other names.

Mr. Coumbe—Just like Mr. Gair and Mr. Duggan?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, just like that. It is not strange that differences exist in political organizations in Australia. I do not find it strange because after all there are a wide number of differing views which can be held between various individuals. People come together into Parties on the basis of certain common fundamentals. There may be differences in detail in regard to policy and administration. It is not surprising that from time to time expression is given to these views within almost any organization. I am not surprised that it happens in the Party of honourable members opposite, nor that it has happened on occasion in my own Party. There was a time when there were three Labor Parties sitting in this Parliament. That situation does not exist now because on basic fundamentals members on this side are thoroughly agreed and upon the matters in our policy there is no disagreement within my Party. We are given the right to differ in opinion upon matters which are not contained in our policy and no direction is given to members in that respect. If we accept the basic policy that is the only matter upon which we are bound.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It does not pay to disagree.

Mr. DUNSTAN—It pays very much less to disagree if one is a member of the Party opposite. Let me give a few examples. Let us refer to the district of Torrens.

Mr. Heaslip—Who has been expelled on this side?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Who lost his pre-selection and why? During the last Parliament one of the most eminent silks in South Australia, one of the best speakers the Liberal Party has ever had, one of the best orators and one with the best education represented the district of Torrens, but what happened to him?

Mr. Heaslip—What did?

Mr. Davis—He disobeyed the master.

Mr. DUNSTAN—He got plebbed. Why? Because within the Liberal Party they do not have—as we do—a prohibition on canvassing and cliques within the Party. Anyone who contravenes those prohibitions in my Party is contravening the Party's rules.

Mr. Dunnage—What did Cameron do to your boys?

Mr. DUNSTAN—We are not permitted to have cliques nor to go around canvassing people trying to get them to vote for various

candidates on plebiscites. The present member for Torrens had to see that a man of Mr. Travers' background and particular views, which he had expressed in this House, did not remain a Liberal Party representative in this House. People went around canvassing against Mr. Travers at the last plebiscite.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Did anyone canvass against the member for Port Adelaide?

Mr. DUNSTAN—If you can produce members who canvassed, they will be brought before the executive of my Party and charged.

Mr. Heaslip—Well what happened to him?

Mr. Coumbe—He got dumped!

Mr. DUNSTAN—He came before the convention in the normal way, a vote was taken of members—

Mr. Heaslip—But did the people dump him?

Mr. DUNSTAN—A vote was taken among Party members and it was recorded against the member for Port Adelaide. That was a democratic process.

Mr. Coumbe—How many were present to vote?

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. DUNSTAN—Let me indicate what happens in the Liberal Party. I hold in my hand a note signed by Sir Shirley Jeffries addressed to members of the Liberal and Country League in Central No. 2 district. He mentions that a committee of which he is chairman is desirous of upholding the interests of the Liberal and Country League in the district and recommends that they vote for Mrs. Cooper.

Mr. Heaslip—What is wrong with that?

Mr. DUNSTAN—People can go around canvassing in favour of or against members of their own Party. Mr. Speaker, what happened to your predecessor in office, Sir Robert Nicholls?

Mr. Dunnage—Tell us what happened to Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Millhouse—Every member has only one vote in our Party.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I will come to that in a moment. What happened to Sir Robert Nicholls? He was an outstanding member of this Parliament. He was completely independent in his views and was renowned for this attitude in the Chair. No Speaker has the record for fairness and sensible control that Sir Robert Nicholls had. Why did he disappear into the limbo?

Mr. Heaslip—We believe in perfect freedom?

Mr. DUNSTAN—“Perfect freedom” is invoked by members opposite for this reason: they knew that had the Labor Party been returned with more members than the present Government, but without sufficient to command a majority on the floor of the House if it had to find a Speaker from amongst its own members, Sir Robert Nicholls would have taken the Chair. His attitude to the Speakership is that the Speaker is above politics, and that is why we saw the disappearance of a man who, although he is a member of a different political Party, is very highly regarded by members on this side, because of his honesty, integrity and service to this State.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Yet you would put the member for Adelaide up against him?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Honourable members opposite have made some remarks on the system of voting which may be invoked at Labor Party conventions. At times the strangest statements and the most wildly inaccurate statements have emanated from members opposite, particularly the Premier during his campaign in Mount Gambier and the member for Torrens, who was so far divorced from the truth in his speech the other day that he said that one member in the Labor Party convention cast 20,000 votes, which is completely absurd. What in fact is the basis of this voting within the Labor Party? At our conventions we seek to give representation to bodies which are extraordinarily different in size. We try to give representation and a voice on the floor of the conference to every sub-branch and union affiliated with the Labor Party. It inevitably happens that some sub-branches have a small number of members, perhaps only 25 or 30, and we want to give these people a voice and we want that voice to be heard. At the same time we have to give representation within the same conference to unions which have on occasions as many as 13,000 or 14,000 members. We are not going to get a democratic system of one vote-one value—

Mr. Dunnage—That is what we do.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I would like the honourable member to let me finish what I am saying. We cannot get one vote-one value if we give one vote to an organization of 13,000 members and exactly the same vote to an organization of 25 members. That would be unjust. What we try to do is to give representation to members by giving them a certain number of delegates, but even this cannot give an accurate representation because if

there were one delegate for every 25 members obviously enough the union with 13,000 members could not get enough delegates at the conference because there would not be a hall large enough to hold them.

Mr. Dunnage—So Mr. Cameron has the lot.

Mr. DUNSTAN—He does not.

Mr. Dunnage—He gets the majority of them.

Mr. DUNSTAN—That is a complete misstatement. The honourable member is only making himself foolish by saying things which are completely untrue.

Mr. Dunnage—You know it is true. Members of your Party have told me that, and I am only repeating what I have heard.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The total number of members normally represented at a conference is about 68,000. The number varies by a few thousand one way or the other, but it is normally about 68,000 affiliated members of the Labor Party. When the card vote is called for each delegate there may cast the appropriate number of votes for the number of affiliated persons he represents. The A.W.U. has six delegates representing its 13,000 members, so each delegate gets slightly over 2,000 votes out of the total of 68,000. That is the largest vote that any one person within the conference has.

Mr. Heaslip—They would all vote on the same ticket.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. It has never been known for all A.W.U. delegates to vote the same way.

Mr. Millhouse—What justification is there for the system?

Mr. DUNSTAN—It is one vote one value. We try to give every affiliated member the same voice in the conference. How could it be worked otherwise? If the organizations to be represented were fairly equal in numbers we would not need any card vote because we would not need to equalize members' voices in the conference according to the number they represent.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—In fact, you do what we do in the electoral system in this State.

Mr. DUNSTAN—We do exactly the opposite. What would happen if there were a card vote here? It would mean that in the casting of votes within this Chamber I would get 23,000 votes and the member for Burnside would get about the same, while the Minister of Lands would get 6,000 votes which would be all he is entitled to.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. DUNSTAN—The Leader of the Opposition would get the number of votes according to the electors he represents in this Chamber, which is all he is entitled to and all he asks for. In other words, the representation in this House would be upon the basis of one vote-one value, because every vote in this State in a card vote system would have exactly the same value in this House.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—What do you think of Mr. Cameron's view that the ballot should be taken by the courts?

Mr. DUNSTAN—What has that got to do with what we are talking about? The honourable member is trying to deflect the interest of the House from the matter we are discussing. Members opposite raised this question of the card vote system; I have explained it to them, and there is very little they can say against it if they stick to the facts. However, they do not want to stick to the facts; those who have talked about it have not quoted the rules or the facts once.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. DUNSTAN—Why did we hear all this nonsense about division in the Labor Party, undemocratic systems and so on? The Labor Party is the greatest political Party in this State; it has more members than any other political Party in this State, and it commands more loyalty and support in this State than any other political Party. Members opposite do their cause very little good when instead of debating policy they make attacks on the Opposition in this manner. These snide, sneering innuendoes and colouring of the facts are normally only resorted to by members opposite in Parliament; they normally only raise this sort of thing when they are afraid to talk about policy. They try to distract the interest of electors from the things that matter. Let me turn to some of them now. Let us get on with the business of this House.

Mr. Dunnage—It is about time you did.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am interested to hear that honourable members opposite think that. Let me now turn to some of the matters that really concern citizens of this State—the policy and administration of its affairs. I am concerned at the situation that exists amongst a certain unfortunate, and unfortunately, growing section of our populace—I refer to our alcoholics. If you go down to the police court

in Victoria Square morning after morning you will see a procession of unfortunates who come into the dock, some of whom have as many as 300 and 400 previous convictions for drunkenness. When they come before the court, they can be released, but if they have no job they go back to gaol again. What is done? They do a certain amount of hard labour for 14 days while they are on the dry, and after they come out, if they can cadge a few bob they are soon before the court again.

Mr. Harding—Get them to make jam.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I do not think that would be a sensible method of dealing with alcoholics. The extraordinary suggestion we heard the other day would not, I think, meet with the consent of anybody interested in the people who would be making the jam. We must take some positive action on the problem of alcoholism, because it is not a personal failure, or a failure of will; it is now widely admitted that it is a disease and that we must do something about it. These poor unfortunate people are not in a position to help themselves once it gets a hold on them. They have not sufficient will power to do anything. Great work has been done by certain voluntary organizations. The work of the Salvation Army in relation to the unfortunates who come before the courts has been remarkable and consistent. More recently, the Anglican rector of Port Adelaide and those associated with him have done much for unfortunates in that area, and even in others. However, they have emphasized that in many cases alcoholics are not prepared to undergo voluntary treatment. It is true that we have a clinic at Northfield where these men can go as voluntary boarders, but the worst type of alcoholic, the type that comes most consistently before the courts, will not submit voluntarily to treatment. He is so much under the control of drink that he is incapable of taking that step, and even if he does, he does not remain there.

The rector of Port Adelaide has emphasized that we must have a home to which these men can be remanded by a magistrate. Since I have been in this House I have repeatedly begged the Government to set up a home under the Inebriates Act. If the Government considers it will cost too much to do this I feel certain that if it is prepared to declare a home under the Act some voluntary organization will come forward and run it. The Government could perhaps offer some subsidy, but something must be done. I am a member of the standing committee on social welfare of

my church and know that it, like every church welfare organization, is concerned about the growing menace of alcoholism and the fact that these poor unfortunates cannot be forced into treatment that is vitally necessary. I hope the Government will take some immediate action on this matter. Despite asking repeated questions and raising this matter in debates I have never had a reply from the Government as to its policy or intentions. We have let this thing go on too long, and unfortunately it is the sort of thing that happens in our so-called social services department in this State that should not happen. There is no department in which there is greater bungling and delay than the department under the Chief Secretary in control of our social services.

Let me refer to another section of that department—the institutions that cater for wards of the State and boys sent for reform treatment. I had a few words to say earlier this year about the situation at Magill. I do not think I need enlarge on conditions there except to say that I am glad that at last staff amenities were improved to a certain extent after I raised the matter in his House and said there was much discontent there. Information has reached me that at last some finalized floor plan has been prepared for a new reformatory at Magill, but it has not yet been referred to the Public Works Committee for investigation. It is now well over two years since it was announced that plans would be prepared for alterations at Magill. I can only say from the information I have been able to obtain about the nature of the plan that it seems to me that the approach by the department to the reformatory problem is quite mistaken and completely contrary to modern reform practice. Having a closed reformatory like that at Magill, with no real effective segregation of the different types of offenders, is not the way to run a reform institution on modern lines. We could have a much cheaper institution or a series of institutions for much less than the expected £400,000 expenditure at Magill.

If some sort of luxurious prison is put up at Magill with walls all around, and a nice swimming pool, picture show and amenities inside, we are still not doing what it is necessary to do in most instances. The running of open reform institutions is standard practice in some of the other States, and it is a successful practice. In Western Australia open reform schools are run in co-operation with church interests. They are not in crowded city

areas but in the country, and they are run extremely effectively. The expenditure on those institutions is nothing like the proposed expenditure at Magill, yet they achieve results that cannot be imagined by those who think modern reform practice will be achieved at Magill. But what happens when the only practicable segregation in an institution is between the boys of school-going age and those not of school-going age? Although I believe that is not the final intention of the department, it happens now and will happen for some time to come. There are on remand and not even convicted boys unsegregated from others at Magill, which is ridiculous.

The magistrates have protested continuously about the lack of a remand home here, and yet nothing seems to be done. However, not only at Magill is there lack of foresight, planning and appreciation of the modern practice in work for State wards. To the Glandore industrial school children are sent who have been charged with being neglected children. Alternatively, they are wards of the Children's Welfare Department who have been placed there after the making of a custody and control order and after conviction for some offence—not merely for being neglected children but for having committed an offence. There are in Glandore boys, who have committed quite serious offences, unsegregated from others who are there merely because their parents have been unwilling to provide adequately for them; and there are the sub-normal as well.

The whole situation at Glandore is unsatisfactory and it is about time that all this section of the Chief Secretary's department under the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board was shaken up. I believe that it is not advisable to continue in existence the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, that here in South Australia we ought to have a Minister for child welfare and social services. They have Ministers responsible for that in other States, but not here. The Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, which comprises mostly people of goodwill and intelligence but who are also part-time amateurs at the game, is not suitable for the administration of a department of this kind. I hope that something will be done to alter both the present system of administration and the work of the department in these matters.

Another matter which must cause concern is something raised repeatedly in this House by the former member for Torrens, but nothing has been done about it: that is, the situation

that exists when people come to the Supreme Court on trial. A man who goes to the Supreme Court on trial is rarely, if ever, granted bail during his trial, regardless of the fact that he has not been convicted and is still in the eyes of the law innocent. Sometimes he is subsequently acquitted but, even if he is, he is required during his trial to be in gaol. There cannot be any sensible justification for a practice of this kind. A man should be refused bail during trial only where it is likely, either from the nature of the offence itself or from his background, that he will try to escape the responsibilities of standing his trial. That is the principle that actuates the courts of summary jurisdiction in deciding whether or not to grant bail. Normally they do. Rarely do they refuse to grant bail. Exactly the same principles should apply to the Supreme Court. It is extraordinary that men who are afterwards found innocent should be required during the period of their trial to be incarcerated in the Adelaide Gaol in conditions which, although somewhat better than those suffered by ordinary prisoners, are nevertheless unpleasant and cause considerable privation and hardship.

I come now to the extraordinary practice of the Police Department in relation to people who have been arrested and are kept in the city watchhouse. Having been arrested during an evening and while waiting to come before the court next morning to apply for their bail, they are paraded in a file and made to walk round. They are often people who have never been convicted of anything, and some are later acquitted. They are paraded up and down in front of the detectives, and the offences with which they are charged, but of which they are not convicted, are read out so that these detectives and other people there who hear about the allegations and observe these people parading up and down can memorize their faces. Although they are in the eyes of the law innocent until they are found guilty, nevertheless they are subjected to this gross indignity. I have known of people accused of quite a heinous offence and subsequently acquitted, but they were made to walk up and down in front of other prisoners and the police officers concerned and allegations against them were read out so that the detectives could memorize their faces for the future. Frankly, I think that is unpardonable. There is not the slightest reason for that sort of thing to happen. It is sensible and correct to hold a parade when men are convicted so that they may be known to mem-

bers of the detective force, but that it should happen to people not convicted but merely charged is most improper.

It is desirable and necessary that leading members of the Government should on occasions go overseas for various purposes, sometimes to inform themselves of the practice of departments like theirs overseas, sometimes to talk about the possibility of industries coming to South Australia, and the like. This is eminently necessary on occasions and should take place but the difference in attitude, which occurs in the press as much as anywhere else, when those going overseas happen to be members of the Labor Party and not members of the Liberal Party is extraordinary. Recently the Premier of New South Wales, a very able and eminent politician in Australia, well regarded by the people of his State and most eloquent, went to the United States for the purpose of having discussions with certain industrial interests there and observing their practice in certain matters of Government and business administration. He returned saying that he had had some interesting discussions, that there seemed a likelihood, after his discussions, of an investment in New South Wales of some 20,000,000 dollars or more in industries, apart from those which had already announced that they were going to New South Wales. Not only in the New South Wales press but also in the press of this State we heard continuous derisory remarks about the trip abroad of Mr. Cahill and his achievements there.

Even more recently the Premier of this State made a trip to the United States for the purpose, apparently, of interesting some industrial business concerns over there in activities in South Australia. There were not the sly references to the cost of trips overseas and that sort of thing that appeared in New South Wales and in the South Australian press in the case of Mr. Cahill. On the contrary, there was a terrific fanfare of trumpets, beating of drums, flying of banners and magnificent announcements about what he was doing for South Australia on this great hush-hush trip, that the Premier was on the job. There were speculations about the millions of pounds' worth of investments he would bring to South Australia. Apparently he had some interesting conversations in the United States, but returned to South Australia unable to say as much as the Premier of New South Wales had to say about what he had achieved in America. What happened? Were the

same sneers levelled at the South Australian Premier about his achievements overseas? Did cartoons appear in the press deriding the Premier on having achieved nothing overseas at the expense of South Australians? They did not, nor do I think they should have, although I viewed the ballyhoo that surrounded our Premier's trip with cynicism. Although much has been done for the industrial development of this State, announcements regarding it are often exaggerated.

Mr. Jennings—This time the announcement may not have been entirely unconnected with a certain event next March.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but it would appear that what was sauce for the goose was not sauce for the gander. I consider that the criticism of the Premier of New South Wales was unfair but also that the ballyhoo concerning our Premier's trip overseas was out of all proportion to its significance and importance to the people of this State and to the matters of administration that concern South Australians. We often hear wonderful announcements about the things that are going to happen in South Australia; for instance, some time ago we heard a remarkable announcement about an atomic power plant for the South-East. It was to be a magnificent project; details appeared in the press; diagrams and pictures were published; a magnificent vista was opening for the people of the South-East. The consequent industrial development in that area was painted in glowing colours. However, we have not got it and on present indications no-one can say when, if ever, we will get it.

We have heard many similar proposals. The Premier is a past master at public relations. Indeed, had he stayed in America I do not doubt that he could have obtained an extremely highly-paid job as president of a public relations firm. The things he puts over are some of the best vaudeville stunts I have seen for many years. Immediately prior to the last State election he was concerned about his party winning the seat of Millicent. He had previously made various statements and promises regarding developments in the area, so he had to think up some variation on the old deep sea port theme and this time he had his picture taken aboard the tug *Tancred*, pumping the hand of its master. The Premier was off in person to survey a new site for a deep sea port in the South-East! Owing to a certain lamentable event, however, the Premier left the tug half way, returned to Adelaide, and did not go to the South-East;

but the effect of the picture was left with the people. They said, "The Premier's on the job again!" The deep sea port, however, is still not there; it has become portable, it gets carted around according to current electoral exigencies. We have heard all sorts of announcements such as a proposed meatworks at Kadina. Then there was a proposed meatworks for the Naracoorte district and the forecast of oil wells in the South-East. Such projects come forward from time to time.

Mr. Jennings—How about the electrification of suburban railways?

Mr. DUNSTAN—We have had that too. Many such things have had their effect on the people. Unless the projects happen to be close to home the people do not remember the announcement. They only remember the cumulative effect: "that the Premier is on the job all the time, achieving miracles for the State." These announcements are also designed to deflect the attention of South Australians from certain other matters about which Government members are always careful not to talk. However, let me talk about them, for they are vitally important. What South Australians lack as much as anything else—and they lack many things—are adequate social services, certainly at the level enjoyed in other States. The following is an extract from the South Australian Government's written submission to the Commonwealth Grants Commission earlier this year:—

An analysis of the revenues and expenditures of the non-claimant States suggests that their net expenditures per head on social services in 1956-57 were approximately as follows:—New South Wales, 375s.; Victoria, 386s.; Queensland, 387s. These indicate a mean of 383s. per head, an increase of 7 per cent on the mean for 1955-56. Net expenditure on social services in South Australia was approximately 357s. per head—

and I remind members that the mean of the non-claimant States was 383s.—

which was an increase of 5½ per cent on the expenditure for the previous year.

Therefore, not only was our figure below the mean of the non-claimant States, but it had not increased at the same rate as that mean. The submission continued:—

With an allowance for greater difficulties at 6 per cent as hitherto the favourable adjustment for 1956-57—

a favourable adjustment we did not get—would be of the order of 49s. per head, or about £2,100,000. The allowance of 6 per cent to South Australia for special difficulties

in the provision of social services was determined in respect of the year 1953-54. Since that time there has been a significantly more rapid increase in the number of children of schoolgoing age in South Australia than elsewhere, and it would be appropriate for the Commission to have regard to this.

Therefore, compared with the Commission's previous assessment of our disabilities, we are now operating under greater difficulties than in 1953-54, and to bring our social services expenditure up to the mean of the non-claimant States would require considerably more than £2,100,000. The submission then sets out the numbers of children in the various States, and continued:—

These figures indicate that, whereas the proportion of children of schoolgoing age increased by about 4.3 per cent on average in the standard States over the three years, the proportion increased by 6 per cent, or about 1.7 per cent more, in South Australia.

The South Australian Government then submitted that in the non-claimant States basic wages in excess of the wages prescribed by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission were paid. The submission continued:—

It is estimated that had South Australia made similar excess payments, they would have increased net social service costs to the extent of about 9s. 9d. per head of population. This will have affected the favourable adjustment to South Australia, which is calculated above at £2,100,000, by about £420,000.

What is the situation facing South Australia? Time after time members of the Commission have said in so many words, "South Australia will not be penalized if it spends on social services to the level of the non-claimant States." What is the Premier's reply? He says, "We ought to get special consideration because we tighten our belts on social services." He has used those words to the Grants Commission. I have the most thickly-populated district in the State and it has many social service problems. Further, other members have many such problems in their districts. When I see the pitiable plight of people in my district who must suffer because of the lack of hospitalization and the demands made upon them for the payment of hospital charges that they cannot fairly afford, I become more and more embittered at the outlook and administration of this Government. The administration by the Government of social services is a crying scandal and it is about time that South Australians knew more about it. Anyone coming from another State and faced with the necessity of applying for social services is appalled at what we have here. The story about our social services is not told

elsewhere. It is not even told for the most part in this State because many of the organs of the State simply do not print it. Why does this set-up in social services exist here? Why is it that the Chief Secretary's Department is in an awful and fantastic mess in relation to the distribution of social services? It comes back to the basic reason that the people of this State lack the very things they need from the Government. The Government is not answerable to the people and until now it has not even thought that it might fear a future election. The situation is of course altered now and we have seen the effect of the alteration by the very things spoken of earlier in this debate, on which I had to spend some time, and it was time which I think members on both sides could have better spent on other things. The reason, of course, is our electoral system.

This Government does not in effect spend on social services either the mean of the non-claimant States or to the level of the other claimant States, which spend far more than we do. The last Commonwealth Grants Commission report shows the comparable expenditure on social services. Western Australia spent 421s. 9d. per head of population, Tasmania 441s. 1d. and South Australia 338s. 4d. South Australia's expenditure was much lower than that of any other State and more than £5 per head less than the amount spent in Tasmania. That is why the member for Millicent finds that the people in his district have to pay fabulous sums for hospitalization. In the other States the hospital situation is far better than it is here. In Victoria and New South Wales subsidized hospitals are subsidized to a far greater extent than in South Australia. No other State lacks public hospital beds as we do. This is the result of our electoral system, and because the Government does not think it is answerable to the people. It does not matter what Government it is or Party, whether ours or any other Party—no Party governs well anywhere unless it has the fear that unless it does what the electors want it will be turned out at the next elections. Members opposite are sitting behind a Government which has not done what the electors want, according to the votes of the electors, on more than one occasion since 1938. The majority of the people are not allowed to elect the Government they want, and Government members cannot deny it.

Mr. Hambour—Would you say that we do not spend money on certain services?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I refer the honourable member to my previous remarks in relation to the effect of the corrected and adjusted Budget results in the Grants Commission's report. I assure the honourable member that I have been to the trouble of discussing the matter with members of the commission and with the economists who checked the position for the Government, and my account is correct.

Mr. Hambour—You are accusing the Government of spending money on other services when it should be spent on social services.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. I am claiming that the Government is not spending money, and therefore is prevented from claiming reimbursement. Because we do not need it to bring our Budgetary standard up to the standard of the other States, we do not get it.

Mr. Hambour—That is a bold statement.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I refer the honourable member to what I said previously on this question. Members on this side have heard it *ad nauseam*. If the honourable member wants it I shall go through the Grants Commission's report with him and explain the effect of the corrected and adjusted Budget results.

Mr. Hambour—You say we would be compensated?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. Not that we would have enough money from the Grants Commission to bring ourselves up to the level of the other States now because we have not spent money on social services as we should in the past, and we are far behind the other States. Consequently we will have to spend more than the other States to bring our standard up to theirs.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—You say we should have a large expenditure and then wait two years to get the position adjusted.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but we would not have had to wait that long if we had spent in the same way as the other States. We could be tided over the period adequately.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—This year we should budget for a big deficit?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, and budget to spend at the same level at least as the other States.

Mr. Riches—What does the Grants Commission regard as social services?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Education, health, hospitals, charities, law, order and public safety.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—The less prosperous States need more spent on them. We are more prosperous here and do not need the money spent.

Mr. DUNSTAN—We have fewer public hospital beds to population than any other State

and I do not think the honourable member will suggest that the incidence of illness is lower here than in any other State and that the need for hospital beds is less than in any of the other non-claimant States. In the non-claimant States people under State Industrial Awards have had cost of living adjustments, which they did not get in this State. The wage earners in those States in need of social services were on a higher scale of real income than here.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—How do you relate that to the savings per head throughout the Commonwealth if we are a poor State?

Mr. DUNSTAN—On what figures do you say our savings per head are greater?

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—On the comparison of Savings Bank deposits per head.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In hardly any other State do institutions like the South Australian State Savings Bank exist.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—They took into account the Commonwealth Savings Bank when fixing the figures.

Mr. DUNSTAN—They did not take the State Government institutions in New South Wales which perform the functions of the South Australian State Savings Bank, or even the trustee banks in the other States.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Do you say that the State Savings Bank is disguising the position when it discloses the figures?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. To suggest that the Savings Bank deposits can be based on a comparison between the total average sum of deposits in both State Savings Bank and the Commonwealth Savings Bank in this State, and the Commonwealth Savings Bank figures only in some of the other States, is fictitious and does not show any logical basis of comparison whatever.

Mr. Hambour—The country hospitals are only a little over 50 per cent occupied, and I do not think the Queen Elizabeth is fully occupied, yet you say more hospital beds are needed.

Mr. DUNSTAN—We need more public hospital beds for the metropolitan population. I can cite many instances of North Terrace specialists asking me to get their patients into the Royal Adelaide Hospital for necessary operations because those specialists, who are honoraries at the hospital, were unable to get their patients admitted.

Mr. Hambour—The Royal Adelaide Hospital has always been full because it charges low fees.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The patients I have in mind needed operations which could not be

performed elsewhere. Furthermore, many people in my district need hospital treatment but cannot afford to pay 25 guineas a week in a private hospital as well as doctors' fees.

Mr. Hambour—Your remarks apply to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, not to the whole hospital services in the State.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Hospital services at Mount Gambier are years behind schedule, and if the honourable member spoke to the boards of the Penola and other South-Eastern hospitals he would ascertain their views of the need for more hospital accommodation there.

Mr. Hambour—My views are entirely different from yours.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I would expect that to be the case, but let me return to the subject of social services. The Government here does not provide adequate social services in this State because it has not so far found it necessary to do so because of our electoral system. Labor Governments in other States believe in providing adequate social services. I do not know that Liberal and Country Party Governments in other States do, but they find it necessary to do so to be elected to office. In South Australia the Government has been protected by the iniquitous electoral system, but there is no moral justification for it.

Mr. Jenkins—You want to centralize more power in the metropolitan area?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, we believe that decentralization in this State is necessary, but some members opposite obviously do not. We heard that specifically from the member for Rocky River yesterday. I understood him to say—and if I am wrong I hope I shall be corrected—that we on this side were kicking up much unnecessary noise about decentralization. I think he also said that there was no harm in the present ratio of city population to country population and that he was not concerned about decentralization and the need for establishing factories in the country.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Has the Labor Party given up its idea of the Greater Adelaide scheme?

Mr. DUNSTAN—What that has to do with the electoral system, I do not know. If the honourable member likes to make relevant interjections, provided they are sensible, I shall endeavour to answer him, but if he interjects, as he so often does in an attempt to get me off the subject, I shall not answer him. It is vital to give the people of this State the right to decide who shall govern them. If the majority accept the Government's policy, let the Government continue in

office, but if they reject the Government's policy it should go out of office. We on this side are prepared to submit our fortunes to the decision of the majority of electors. If the majority do not want what we advocate we should not be in office, but it is wrong that when the majority vote consistently for the policy of the Labor Party they are unable to elect the Government of their choice. It is shameful that this situation should exist in the Parliamentary government of this country. In South Australia we have the most fantastic example of gerrymandering that Australians have ever had the misfortune to know.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—In Western Australia there are only 1,500 electors in some districts.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The system there was introduced by the Liberal Party in Western Australia and has been perpetuated by an independent commission, but although that system is not one that my Party supports, members opposite cannot deny that the majority of electors decide who shall be the Government in Western Australia. That is also the case in Queensland. I have often said I disagreed with the system there, but the point is that in no State, except South Australia, is there an electoral system under which the Government is elected by a minority of the people, and a small minority at that. Members opposite cannot gainsay what I have said on that score. No arithmetical calculation, Dr. Forbes notwithstanding, can arrive at any different conclusion on what the majority of South Australians want, but they have been prevented from electing the Government of their choice because of our electoral system. Despite the halts that members opposite have seen fit most shamefully to place upon the people to prevent them getting the Government they want, that system itself will fail them next March. Then the people will at last get the Government they want, and it will alter the electoral system so that the Party in office, of whatever political complexion, will be completely answerable to the majority. South Australians will be able to elect the Government they want, and reject the Government they do not want.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 19, at 2 p.m.