

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 16, 1969.

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

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER presented a petition signed by 96 persons stating that the signatories were deeply convinced that the human baby began its life no later than the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in its mother's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception), that any direct intervention to take away its life was a violation of its right to live, and that honourable members, having the responsibility to govern this State, should protect the rights of innocent individuals, particularly the helpless. The petition also stated that the unborn child was the most innocent and most in need of the protection of our laws whenever its life was in danger. The signatories realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances claimed to necessitate it on account of the life of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not amend the law to extend the grounds on which a woman might seek an abortion but that, if honourable members considered that the law should be amended, such amendment should not extend beyond a codification which might permit current practice.

Mr. BROOMHILL presented a similar petition signed by 604 persons.

Petitions received.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the debate on the Estimates the Premier referred to certain events at Port Lincoln and, in the course of his remarks concerning the high school there, he said:

As I left, some teachers said, "Of course, Mr. Hall, we want you to know that we resent the label that this is the worst school in South Australia, because it is not the worst school." The teachers who said this were proud members of an honoured profession, and they said they were teaching well at the Port Lincoln High School and training children to become competent members of our society. Senior students of the high school interviewed me on

the Friday night when I had my meeting, and I have yet to see more competent people than those students. They were labouring, under the eyes of all South Australians, under the label of the worst school in South Australia. And who said this?—Mr. Dunstan, the Leader of the Opposition. They resented it.

In my reply to the Premier I pointed out that what I had said about schools in the presence of teachers (and they agreed with me and I repeated it later) was that, regarding high schools, I considered that Port Lincoln had the worst facilities of any high school I had seen. I then went on to say:

The teaching at that school was going on under grave difficulties, which the teachers outlined to me in detail. We will soon find out whether the Premier's remarks on this subject are accurate, because I intend to send a report of this to the teachers at Port Lincoln, who thanked me for my interest and my appreciation of the difficulties, which they outlined to me in great detail.

As I undertook to do, I sent extracts from *Hansard* containing the Premier's remarks and my own to the Acting Headmaster of the school, who was the teacher who had requested me to go to the school and who had seen me in the presence of other teachers at the school. The following is a letter I have received from the Acting Headmaster:

Dear Mr. Dunstan,

Thank you for your letter of October 2. No teacher here resented the views you expressed to us at Port Lincoln High School. You made it clear that you were speaking of general facilities and some of our buildings. However, in its first issue (August 28, 1969), following your visit to Port Lincoln, *The Port Lincoln Times* printed the unqualified banner headline, "High School Worst in S.A." Preceding this, in smaller print, were the words, "Dunstan's Shock Claim". Following the headline, also in smaller print, were the words:

"The Port Lincoln High School was probably the worst equipped high school in the State." This condemnation was made by the Leader of the State Opposition, Mr. Don Dunstan, in a special interview with the *Times* this week.

The substance of the article thus introduced was concerned only with comments on buildings and facilities, and teachers' militancy in these matters. What I and other teachers here deplored was the blanket banner headline quoted above, and one or more of us made this clear both to the Premier and the Treasurer, adding that, despite the conditions under which we worked, we were proud of the curricula and extra-curricula successes that have been achieved by students and staff alike, and that we accordingly deplored false publicity created by taking a statement out of its proper context. In respect of the cuttings you sent me, it is the view of teachers here who met both yourself and Mr. Hall that there is no distortion in the remarks made by you in the passage which you have marked.

That is the passage from *Hansard* that I have just read to the House as my reply to the Premier. The letter continues:

In conclusion, Sir, two matters: One is that teachers at this school reiterate what we consider was plainly said on the occasions of your visit and Mr. Hall's, namely, that we neither promoted nor wish to be involved in a game of political football.

Mr. Rodda: Ha, ha!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If that is the honourable member's comment, I will send that to the teachers, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Langley: They have enough trouble now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader received leave of the House to make a personal explanation. I have ruled previously that when a member is making a personal explanation to the House, he is entitled to be heard in silence. If members will not uphold the dignity of the Chair I will have to take appropriate action. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Acting Headmaster's letter continues:

Secondly, I read your letter and enclosures to most members of our staff, and can assure you that other signatures will be forthcoming, if required, to support my reply.

QUESTIONS

HORMONE SPRAYS

Mr. WARDLE: My question, as have many that I have asked in the past few months, concerns the loss in my district through hormone spray drifting in the atmosphere and causing much damage to tomatoes and cucumbers. Can the Treasurer say what the Treasury is able to do for people who have been placed in difficult financial circumstances because of this damage presumed to have been caused by hormone sprays?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the case of calamity, it is provided that primary producers may apply to the Minister of Lands for assistance on account of hardship. However, I point out to the honourable member that there are definite limitations on what hardship comprises. Briefly, they are that assistance is available to people who, as a result of some misfortune or calamity, have suffered a loss that would prevent them from continuing production. It is not intended that assistance should merely be in the form of compensation for loss sustained. It means that where the loss sustained causes hardship and where the

primary producer is, because of that loss, prevented from continuing his activity, he may apply for assistance. Also, it is required that he should have exhausted other avenues of obtaining financial assistance and that he should have reasonable prospects of resuming production in a profitable sense. It would not be available to a person who, quite apart from a situation of calamity, found himself in normal financial difficulties and could not carry on for that reason. Therefore, there is provision for hardship: it does not relate merely to compensation for loss, but it requires that an applicant needs assistance in order to continue his activity. This assistance is available if the applicant applies to the Minister of Lands.

YORKE PENINSULA ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the erection of an office block and classroom at the adult education centre at Kadina?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is regretted that the erection of the headquarters building for the Yorke Peninsula Adult Education Centre at Kadina has been delayed for so long because of the protracted negotiations for a site. It is not possible to give any date for the commencement of building operations, but it is clear that matters are reaching a stage that should enable the building to be erected reasonably early in 1970. The Finsbury Works Branch of the Public Buildings Department is fully committed until the end of the year in constructing essential classrooms for the reopening of schools in February, 1970, so that, even if the site could be finalized soon, the buildings could not be proceeded with immediately.

PORT PIRIE FIRE

Mr. EDWARDS: I direct my question to the member for Port Pirie. On Tuesday last the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) asked the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, a question about the action or lack of action of the Port Pirie fire brigade relating to a fire near Port Pirie. To my surprise, this question evoked a show of considerable annoyance from the member for Port Pirie. I make it clear that the member for Rocky River, in asking this question, was greatly concerned about the heavy loss that could have occurred in the northern agricultural districts, a portion of which the honourable member has the honour to represent in this Parliament, because, had the fire got out of control, it would have affected his district

greatly. In view of the surprising reaction of the member for Port Pirie, and on the basis that this question relates to his district, would he, in view of his attitude, be prepared to confer with his colleague the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) with a view to obtaining his co-operation, and perhaps the co-operation of all other members, in refraining from asking questions pertaining to the districts of other members?

The SPEAKER: Order! Previously, I have ruled that questions concerning policy matters should not be directed to a private member. However, as this is a general district matter, I think it is in order. Does the member for Port Pirie desire to reply?

Mr. McKEE: The only comment I should like to make is that the member for Eyre is out of control and out of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Some country members travel all over the State continually, thus passing through districts represented by other members. If a member sees something of interest to the State generally in another member's district, can you say, Mr. Speaker, whether that member is at liberty to ask a question concerning the other member's district?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked whether members are entitled to ask questions about another member's district. As the member travels through the State—

Mr. McKee: He ought to know; he does plenty of it.

The SPEAKER: Who is answering this question? The honourable member is not in order. I wish to answer the question this way: Having been honoured and privileged to be a member of this House for many years, I have noticed in previous years that there has always been an unwritten law (a sort of camaraderie) amongst members in that they do not like to interfere unduly in matters concerning districts that are not their own. However, if a matter concerns Government or Opposition policy, the general rule is waived so that members can obtain information on a general matter appertaining to the whole State. This unwritten law has operated for many years. Naturally, the member who represents a district considers that it is his preserve and that it is his prerogative to raise matters concerning it. He is resentful if another member asks questions about his district because he fears (and the fear may be justified or unjustified) that his

constituents will think he has neglected his district when they hear that another member has asked a question about it. I think that in the interests of members, their districts, and their constituents it is a good thing for this unwritten law to be maintained, except in cases of general matters of Government or Opposition policy.

Mr. EDWARDS: I refer again to the recent Port Pirie fire incident, when the fire brigade did not go over the boundary to fight a fire because it was considered to be in a country area. I do not think this is good practice, as we all know that fire is very dangerous and that it knows no boundaries. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture why the Port Pirie fire brigade did not put out the fire, even though it was just beyond its boundary? This is a bad time of the year and if this sort of boundary incident goes on a major disaster could occur.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand that shortly after the incident was reported the chief of the fire brigade said that he would inquire into the circumstances. I have not heard the result of that inquiry, but I will ask my colleague for further information.

USED CARS

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to a question I asked last week about excess charges by some secondhand car dealers?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No.

ADULT EDUCATION COURSES

Mr. GILES: The Adult Education Section of the Education Department issues a publication called *A Student's Guide*. A problem arises from the fact that the last publication, for 1969, was not released until March. Will the Minister of Education see whether this publication, which sets out the various courses handled by the Adult Education Section, can be released before Christmas this year so that intending students for adult education courses will know what courses will be available to them so that they can enrol?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

PINNAROO AND TINTINARA SCHOOLS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my recent question about change-rooms to be provided at the Pinnaroo and Tintinara Area Schools?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Preliminary sketch plans have been prepared for a combined change-room and toilet block, and

the merits of this design for use at certain schools are being examined. As it may be several months before this new design will be developed in detail, the immediate requirements for toilet and change-room facilities at schools are being met by using separate existing designs. Requests have been received by the Public Buildings Department for the erection of new toilets at the Pinnaroo Area School and for new toilets and change-rooms at the Tintinara Area School. It is proposed to use existing designs to expedite the provision of these facilities, and it is currently programmed to call tenders for the work early in the new year.

MILK QUALITY

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the quality of milk and the stamping of milk cartons sent to Leigh Creek from, I understand, the Golden North organization in Clare?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that there is no obligation on dairy companies to code-mark milk, except in the case of pasteurized milk supplied in bottles or cartons in the metropolitan area.

WHEAT STORAGE FINANCE

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about wheat storage?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In reply to the honourable member and to the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), who also asked a question about this matter, the Minister of Agriculture states that all questions about wheat asked by honourable members have been replied to. The reply to the question asked by the member for Rocky River about the terms on which storage is made available to South Australia by the Wheat Board under special arrangements announced recently by the Minister for Primary Industry is as follows:

Funds will be drawn by the board from the rural credits department of the Reserve Bank against drawing limits previously established for payment of expenses, including storage, handling and transport. Repayment will be on the same terms as is borrowing for the first advance. The interest rate is currently 5 per cent. The facilities would be the property of the board.

The facts given to the member for Frome on October 7, in reply to his question on notice regarding available storages in South Aus-

tralia, were supplied by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. The two matters raised by the members for Rocky River and Frome do not appear to conflict. When the Minister of Agriculture replied to the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) on October 8, the details of the terms and conditions had not been confirmed by the Minister for Primary Industry. Following urgent representations to him, a telegram was received, and the contents form part of the reply to the member for Rocky River.

LEAF CUTTER BEE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the leaf cutter bee?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

I am pleased to inform the honourable member that I have now received advice from the Commonwealth Minister for Health that approval has been granted for the introduction into this State of specimens of the leaf cutter bee for research purposes. Importation will be permitted subject to certain conditions, and arrangements to implement the project are in the hands of the Agriculture Department. I am indebted to the honourable member for his efforts to bring these somewhat protracted negotiations to a successful conclusion.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. McKEE: On several occasions I have asked the Premier questions regarding the supply of spectacles to country pensioners, and in reply to a question asked by the member for Mount Gambier some time ago the Premier said that a letter, a reply to which he was then awaiting, had again been sent to the Commonwealth Minister for Health informing him of the State's interest in the matter and asking him for a report on the latest progress made regarding the submissions of the Australian Medical Association. Has the Premier any further information?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No.

ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding road safety?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The advertisement calling for public submissions on road safety was inserted in the magazine section of the *Advertiser* on Saturday, September 6, 1969. The South Australian Government Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety intended that the request for public submissions should receive maximum publicity at

minimum cost, and it was advised that placement in the magazine section would best meet this criterion. The committee has been gratified by the public response to the advertisement, and no further publicity was undertaken. Direct approaches have been made to public authorities and organizations known to be interested in various aspects of road safety.

BURRA GAS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to my recent question regarding a proposed gas pipeline to Burra?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Commercial Manager of the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority has informed me that provision has been made in the pipeline for a compressor station to be established, when required, about 10 miles west of Burra and that this would be a convenient point from which take-off could be arranged to supply industrial premises at Burra.

SEACOMBE ROAD

Mr. HUDSON: Seacombe Road, in my district, is probably one of the worst roads in the metropolitan area, and for a long time its reconstruction has been delayed, first by the necessity to construct a stormwater drain (namely, Drain No. 10) as part of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. After that work was completed, road work on Seacombe Road had to be delayed for at least a year to allow proper settlement of the earth to take place. The Highways Department has now agreed to provide certain sums to the Brighton and Marion councils to enable them to commence reconstructing the road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when work is likely to commence and how far it is likely to have progressed by the end of this financial year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask for the information.

ACCIDENT INSURANCE

Mr. EVANS: Recently in the Adelaide Hills a school bus overturned when a leaf of its front spring broke. Fortunately, only a few children were travelling on the bus at the time and no serious injuries were sustained. However, I can foresee difficulties arising when a latent fault is the cause of an accident, as no claim can then be made on the third party compulsory insurance. Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether, when a school bus is involved in an accident which is caused by a latent fault and in which no

negligence can be proved, the schoolchildren are covered regarding compensation for any injury they may receive?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I think a question pertaining to this accident was asked by another member last week, and I have called for a report.

Mr. Evans: This is a different accident.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Then I will call for a report to ascertain the true position.

LAND AGENT

Mr. VIRGO: I regret to say that I am raising with the Attorney-General what appears to be yet another shonky dealing by land agents.

Mr. McKee: Any particular land agent?

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. For the information of the House, the land agent is Geoffrey K. Benny, who had a contract sale note signed for the sale of a property for \$8,750, but attached to this were conditions, one being that the contract was subject to the Superannuation Fund's lending money. A further clause provided that, if the money could not be provided immediately, temporary finance would be provided. However, it was subsequently shown by the inspection of the Superannuation Department that this would-be purchaser was taken for a ride in that he was told the house was only 35 years old, whereas it was 47 years old. Also, salt damp in the walls had been painted over in an endeavour to hide this defect. Now the sale is not proceeding because the Superannuation Department, understandably, will not lend the money. Although the agent, I understand, has now sold the property to some other "sucker", he will not return the \$500 deposit that this person paid. I am also gravely disturbed because I understand that this person approached the Land Agents Board, but the board has said that it can do nothing. As this is a matter of grave importance, if I give the Attorney-General papers on this matter will he have a thorough investigation conducted into the activities of this land agent?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Certainly. I regret that the member for Port Pirie interjected and goaded the honourable member into revealing the name of the land agent concerned. There may or may not be another side to the story; I do not know. I suggest that an injustice can be done to persons if they are named in the House in this way. If the honourable member gives me the papers I will certainly have an investigation made.

POLICE PATROLS

Mr. GILES: The cost of road accidents to Australia has been estimated to be more than \$400,000,000 a year. In South Australia last weekend eight people were killed on the road, and that is an atrocious situation. I believe the main contributing factor to the high accident rate is careless and inattentive driving. On the highway between Adelaide and Bordertown (and I have permission from the member for Murray to mention his district) two people were killed during the long weekend, one at Kanmantoo and the other at Yumali. In the Eastern States traffic police patrol regularly between major towns on the major highways, and this tends to make motorists more careful. Semi-trailer drivers have told me that in South Australia, however, for much of the time police patrol cars are parked and not patrolling the highways.

Last week a police patrol vehicle was parked half a mile up the Rockleigh Road, near Callington, timing semi-trailers coming down the Callington Hill. Knowing the distance, the police could work out the speed, and they were booking semi-trailer drivers exceeding the speed limit on this downhill run. Because motorists generally travel at fairly high speeds in country areas, it is essential that the drivers of motor vehicles be attentive at all times. Will the Premier examine the policy of the Police Department to see whether it can be changed in order that police cars will patrol roads more often so that, on seeing them, drivers will tend to be more careful and keep their wits about them?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member is referring to one of the great questions of our time; that is, the enormous number of road accidents, which result in suffering and economic loss. I will ask the Chief Secretary whether more police patrols can operate along South Australian roads. However, I believe that it would be a sorry state of affairs if most South Australian motorists showed consideration for their fellow motorists only when police patrols were nearby. If South Australian motorists were as selfish as this, it would be economically impossible to provide enough patrols to enforce the road laws. I hope that in the years to come we can instil into South Australian motorists a real consideration for their fellow human beings on the road and, as a result, there may be greater safety for their passengers and other road users. I will direct the honourable member's question to the Chief Secretary and ascertain whether further action is possible from within the resources of the Police Force.

NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about a northern road that I asked a few weeks ago?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member's question was asked on September 24, about three weeks ago, so I suggest that in the circumstances the delay has not been unreasonable. My colleague states:

The Arkaroola-Balcanaona road serves the needs of tourism and mineral exploration, and also provides access to Arkaroola station. Because of increased usage of this road, the previous graded track deteriorated into long sections of "bulldust", and the Highways Department decided to re-form the road and to rubble-sheet it. This type of work was thought to represent the best treatment to provide the minimum facility required and to reduce future maintenance costs and effort.

Work proceeded intermittently on the road for some six months. From time to time the gang engaged on the work carried out maintenance works on other roads in the area. The cost of re-forming and sheeting the 16 miles of the Arkaroola road averaged \$4,000 a mile, which is considered to be a reasonable investment.

In time, the Balcanaona-Blinman road will require attention, as will many other roads through the Flinders Ranges. However, planning on an overall basis is not sufficiently advanced at this stage to provide any expected dates of commencement of major works.

Mr. VENNING: Work on the road from Booleroo Centre to Murray Town was held up pending a contract being let for a cutting through Magnus Hill. This contract was eventually let, and the work has been completed. The materials excavated from Magnus Hill have been crushed, and a portion of the road has been sand sealed. However, since the hard stone in Magnus Hill has been excavated there has been a slide of rock on the angle of the batter; this has further delayed the completion of work on this road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what is the present situation, whether a further contract will be let to alter the batter on the cutting through Magnus Hill, and whether it is planned that this road will be completely sealed before the coming harvest?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to find out.

MODBURY ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: The Main North-East Road has been widened to its intersection with Smart Road at Modbury; from that point on, the road is too narrow for present-day traffic.

Consequently, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when the next section of this road will be widened?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will find out.

INSURANCE

Mr. HURST: A constituent alleges that an insurance company has been advertising on television and in the press that it will insure motor vehicles at a reduced premium and that an impression is gained from this advertisement that repairs will be effected within a week. My constituent was involved in an accident at 4.20 p.m. on about July 24, and he says that at 5 p.m. he telephoned the insurance company. A couple of days later a claim form arrived which was returned immediately to the insurance company. On September 12 he was asked to deliver his car to an automotive works for repair, and he has had considerable difficulty in getting it back. I made representations to the insurance company, setting out the facts I have outlined (which the company did not deny) and informing it that I thought the advertisement was misleading. However, the manager said that my constituent was not correct, as the T.V. advertisement said that repairs would be done "in a wink" and not "within a week". However, that was the only mistake my constituent made in reporting the incident to me. Can the Attorney-General say whether there is any way in which action can be taken against such companies, which are apparently by false advertising misleading people into entering into contracts with them?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I should be greatly surprised if any legal action could be taken, but if the honourable member tells me the name of the company and gives details of the advertisement I will inquire and consider what action can be taken.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of September 23 in which I sought information about unoccupied Railways Department houses in my district?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: There are several Railways Department dwellings in the metropolitan area at present unoccupied. It is inevitable that a proportion of the total will be vacant owing to the movement of railway employees throughout the State following promotion and transfer, and also because of retirements and resignations. Over the

past three years the Railways Department has disposed of 20 surplus dwellings in the metropolitan area, the last as recently as January this year. It is intended to arrange, through the Housing Trust, for the disposal of others soon, having regard to the demand of the market.

FAIRVIEW PARK INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: The intersection of Hancock Road and Yatala Vale Road, Fairview Park, has become dangerous, mainly because, as it is on the fringe of the metropolitan area, some motorists think it is not necessary to observe the 35 miles an hour speed limit. Although I know that the local council also is involved in this matter, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider making this intersection safer?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

TEROWIE TOWNSHIP

Mr. CASEY: As I understand the Attorney-General has a reply to my recent question about the Terowie water supply, will he give that reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I am giving the honourable member the usual courteous, efficient and speedy service to which he is accustomed. Following upon the extension of the broad gauge to Peterborough, it is expected that 19 dwellings of habitable standard will become redundant at Terowie. Approximately one half of these will be available for removal to other localities, and it is expected that this will be done progressively. The water supply serving Terowie is derived from two sources, namely, the Gumbowie reservoir, and Burra station from which water is carted when Gumbowie reservoir is dry. There are seven outsiders connected to the existing reticulation at Terowie, each connection being covered by an agreement. Water is supplied at the rate of 75c for 1,000 gallons, with the Railways Commissioner reserving the right to increase this rate up to \$2 to cover costs consequent upon the rail movement of water, when necessary.

Mr. Casey: It has never been done yet.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No request will be made to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief to acquire the existing water supply undertaking at Terowie.

BARLEY

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of October 7 about barley marketing?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the procedure for marketing barley of the 1969-70 harvest will not differ from that which has obtained in the past. All barley, other than that retained on the farm for consumption there, must be delivered to the Australian Barley Board. The cards recently posted to known barley growers by the Australian Barley Board sought information on acreage and likely deliveries, which was aimed at assisting planning for marketing and shipping.

WHEAT SILOS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question of October 9 regarding the provision of wheat silos?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

The implication in the preamble to the question by the honourable member, that his previous inquiry, on September 23, regarding wheat silos had not been answered, is incorrect. A reply to that question was given on October 1. I am not aware of the conditions upon which the additional storage facilities announced by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry will be financed by the Australian Wheat Board, and I have written asking for urgent advice of the proposed arrangements. However, I assure the honourable member that the agreed price of \$1.10 a bushel as the first payment on quota wheat will not be affected by the additional storage to be made available under the Commonwealth Government scheme.

WARNING DEVICES

Mr. BURDON: The Attorney-General will recall that some time ago I asked him a question about the possibility of providing warning devices, by contract, at railway crossings at Mount Gambier. I understand that the Highways Department supplies the funds to provide warning devices at railway crossings and that the Railways Department carries out the work, but it seems that there is delay in allocating money for such work. As some time has elapsed since I asked the Attorney to find out from the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this work could be speeded up by having it carried out by contract, will the Attorney ask his colleague whether any progress has been made in this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

ADULT EDUCATION CLASSES

Mrs. BYRNE: I am concerned whether the outer suburban section of the Barossa District is adequately served by adult education classes

and whether a centre should not be erected closer to that area, or within the area. The country section of the district is very well served by the Gawler Adult Education Centre. Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on how such areas as Tea Tree Gully, Modbury, Highbury, and Hope Valley are served by adult education classes?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not think there are any adult education centres in the places to which the honourable member has referred. In fact, I think the Adelaide Adult Education Centre would serve people in those areas. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member on this matter.

STANDING ORDERS

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That proposed new Standing Order 143A relating to "Time limit on speeches" as recommended in the Standing Orders Committee Report, 1969, be adopted.

In moving this motion, I do so as a member of the Standing Orders Committee and, first of all, I canvass the reasons which impelled the committee to recommend the adoption of time limits on speeches. I think that all members have realized that, in the last two sessions in particular (and this has been a gradual and continuing process over a number of sessions), the volume and complexity of work before the House has increased and, indeed, the work of individual members in connection with their own districts has increased and this has stimulated a great deal more business for the House than in days gone by. At present, we are the only Parliament in Australia, so far as my researches have extended, which does not have any time limit on speeches. I have a schedule which sets out the limits on speeches in the various Australian Parliaments and the various limits within those Parliaments and which I will make available to any honourable member.

Mr. Clark: Could it be included in *Hansard*?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is not strictly statistical and, therefore, I do not think I could ask to have it included in *Hansard* without my reading it. As a rule, the time limits proposed in the Standing Order are a good deal longer than those in other Parliaments. It may be said, in answer, that this Parliament is a comparatively small one but, if members care to look at the time limits in the Tasmanian Parliament (which has 35

members, I think), they will see that our proposed limits compare favourably with Tasmania's.

Mr. Hurst: Do they make better speeches there?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that. Those, broadly, are the reasons that impelled the committee to make this recommendation. Frankly, I was not in favour of time limits until recently. I think that last year in the committee I voted against time limits, but I have come to the conclusion that now is an opportune time to introduce limits so long as they are of sufficient length and do not deny any member an opportunity to put his point of view on any topic, and I do not consider that the proposed limits do so restrict a member. Certainly, it will be necessary to have time limits if the House is increased from 39 members to 47 members which, I am happy to say, seems certain to occur.

Mr. Corcoran: When will they apply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think from the time they are presented to the Governor, pursuant to the Constitution Act. I understand that all members have seen the proposed new Standing Order with the limits set out.

Mr. Lawn: Are copies available?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, they were circulated yesterday, and those time limits are generous. For example, in the Address-in-Reply debate, every member will get one hour, and in two important areas of activity in the House there are no limits, namely, during Question Time, which may last for two hours (which is, I think, the longest Question Time allowed in any Parliament in Australia and which is something that members prize), and in the Committee stages of debate. Although there are limits in some other Parliaments, it seemed to the committee that, at this time at least, there was no warrant for suggesting time limits in Committee. My experience is that a long speech is not necessarily, or even usually, a good one. I suppose that most members, before they came to the House, had experience as debaters in formal debates outside, and in those debates there was invariably a limit on the length of the speech. I believe that a time limit on any debate obliges closer preparation of one's material and, therefore, as a rule it is a better speech. Anyone can go on and on and on like the brook and bring up points as he thinks of them and padding for the rest, but if one wants to make a good speech it must

be prepared. If there is a time limit a speaker is careful to see that he gets all the relevant points in and presents them concisely to his audience. For this reason, I do not think that the proposed limits will in any way inhibit members in presenting their case. On the other hand, the limits should raise the standard of debate and allow the House to get through its work more expeditiously.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I endorse the Attorney-General's remarks.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member for Adelaide seconding the motion?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The Standing Order involved is set out in this morning's *Advertiser* at page 7, together with some comment. The Attorney-General said that, when this matter came before the Standing Orders Committee last year, he was opposed to the suggestion that time limits be introduced on speeches in this Parliament. The reason the matter came before the committee then was that my Party had just been voted out of office and had had the experience, during the years 1965-68, of hours of filibustering by the Opposition. Every time a motion was moved for the House to go into a Committee of Supply it was debated at length, and our members considered that time limits should be imposed on speeches. This suggestion was put to the committee but was rejected. However, the committee subsequently realized that the membership of the House might be increased from 39 members to 47 members, so the matter was again put before it. On that occasion I am pleased to say that the Attorney-General had a change of heart and, although the committee had no easy road (it took a few meetings to reach a decision), it ultimately made a unanimous recommendation to the House, as set out in the circular provided to members.

The committee considered that one hour for members for the Address in Reply debate was sufficient, 45 minutes for debate on Bills, and 30 minutes for a third reading. I consider that 30 minutes is ample time for a third reading, which we do not always debate, although one was debated yesterday and the member who spoke took less than 15 minutes. The committee considered that it was not imposing any severe restriction on members, as the times recommended are much more generous than those in other States and in the Commonwealth Parliament. Although other Parliaments have time limits on speeches in Committee and a limit on the number of times a member may speak, the Standing Orders Committee made no such recommendation. We will

continue the present practice of a member speaking for an unlimited period and for an unlimited number of times in Committee. These recommendations should be given a trial, and when the House has 47 members we can consider whether further restrictions should be imposed.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I oppose the motion. I do not believe that, by allowing a member unlimited time on some occasions and for him to be limited to 45 minutes or one hour on others, we will gain anything. If every member spoke to the limit of the time allowance, there might be plenty of filibusters.

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Wallaroo may be embarrassed.

Mr. Jennings: Not as embarrassed as you looked yesterday.

Mr. EVANS: These stupid interjections are typical examples of time wasting. The member for Adelaide should consider what his colleagues have been doing in the field of filibustering before accusing Government members of doing the same when they were in Opposition. If time limits are imposed now, further limits will be imposed when the matter is next considered and, although we believed when we became members that we would have certain freedoms, there is now talk of restricting them. If all members used their permitted time the speed with which the business of the House was conducted would not be increased. I have spoken for more than one hour in at least three debates, and I am not ashamed of doing that. After reading *Hansard* I found that you, Mr. Speaker, when speaking about wheat, on one occasion spoke for two hours or more, so I hope that you will not advocate restricting the rights of members, as you have had the benefit of unlimited speech time for 35 years. The speech you made, Sir, had few wasted words and was a good one. Perhaps if you had spoken for one hour only you would not have been able to say what you wanted to say. No-one should restrict your right to speak, because you represent the people in the District of Ridley.

Many members consider that this motion, if passed, will solve the problems of conducting the business of the House at a faster rate, but this will not be so. Although I am not a betting man, I will wager that no more business will be put through the House under these new conditions, and that the speeches will be no better. In the Commonwealth Parliament, where a time limit is imposed, if members do not speak for their full time they are considered to be poor speakers. They use

the full time, and by doing so nothing is gained. Obviously, speeches made in that Parliament do not contribute any more to a debate than do the speeches here where our time is not limited.

Mr. Clark: That is an insult to us.

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member is admitting that where a limited time is used for speeches they are worse than the speeches here with our unlimited time. I cannot support a motion to take away from members the right to speak as long as they wish to on any subject.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): The member for Onkaparinga seems to be temperamentally unfit to agree with a decision that he thinks most members are going to make. I am not criticizing the honourable member, but I support the motion. The Attorney-General said that many members had been interested in debating before becoming members, and I know that he was a prominent debater. I also did plenty of it, but perhaps people who listen to the Attorney and to me wonder how we received good marks in debating contests. I think the answer is that we were allotted a specific time for the debate. When I first became a member I thought in the same way as the member for Onkaparinga does now. My late friend, Mr. Fred Walsh, member for Thebarton, told me in strong language that I spoke too long. I had thought that if I did not speak for an hour I was not doing a good job. I am sure that we would agree that most lengthy speeches are a waste of time. Speeches made by debaters are usually much better than those made in this Chamber, because a debater is usually limited to a certain time, and he makes sure that he says in that time what he wants to say. The late Mick O'Halloran often said, "Stand up, speak up, and shut up." This is good advice for all members.

Although the member for Onkaparinga said he was not ashamed of any of his long speeches, he should read them again and I am sure that he would find that much of them could have been omitted. No doubt these speeches, although good at the time, would have been equally as good if they had been half the length, particularly if he had said what he wanted to say in the shorter period. In a debate yesterday an honourable member continued speaking after asking last week for leave to continue his remarks. In my opinion last week he made an excellent contribution to the debate but what he said yesterday, compared with what he said the previous week,

was not worth listening to. I do not say this to denigrate the honourable member, because I thought that what he said last week was good, but his remarks yesterday antagonized members.

Even if the time limits being imposed on our speeches do not save the time of the House, they will improve the quality of speeches. I am certain that being put in the position of having to reduce the length of their speeches will be good for many members who speak for too long—and that applies to all of us at times. I think the member for Onkaparinga mentioned the somewhat lengthy speeches made by yourself, Mr. Speaker, in the past. Without wishing in any way to be nasty, I can remember that some honourable members would have been pleased had you made somewhat shorter speeches. I give my completely unqualified support to this motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I support this motion wholeheartedly. Like the member for Gawler and most other honourable members in this House, I have thought for a long time that the speeches of honourable members have been much too long. It is often the case that the longer the speech the less the preparation that has gone into it and the greater the repetition it contains. I am in no way casting reflections on the House when I say that since I have been a member of this place I have been desperately bored on many occasions by long speeches, many of which only repeated in their later stages what had been said in the first few minutes.

Mr. Virgo: And by the same member year after year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Exactly. Of course, every honourable member has his own characteristics. Nobody is perfect; we all have our faults. Much of the trouble has been caused by the increase in the number of interjections. In saying that, I am not reflecting on any particular member or side of the House, but the interjections have grown to what may be called a stupid degree. Whether or not the speeches were better prepared 20 years ago I do not know, but at least they read much better than do the speeches these days. I believe that interjections are responsible for spoiling members' speeches to a large extent but, in addition to that, members appear to be taking longer and longer to say what they want to say. I am not trying to make a speech designed to bring the Opposition immediately

to its feet in angry denial, but the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) accused this side of filibustering a few years ago.

Mr. Clark: And he had good reason to.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It may be appropriate if I mention some of the research I have been doing over the last few weeks of this session when I have had to spend so much time sitting and listening to what has been said. First of all, I searched through *Hansard* for the 1969 session to find out how often Question Time lasted for two hours. I found that up to the time I completed this research (I do not claim it is a piece of imperishable research that cannot be improved upon) there had been 36 sitting days, on 10 of which the bell had rung at 4 o'clock to end Question Time. I also found that, when five minutes to four had been reached, questions often folded up, so the ringing of the bell was not necessary on some occasions, even though Question Time had occupied virtually two hours.

Then I started counting the pages in *Hansard* as a quick means of getting an idea of how questions had been running and I found that, for questions to continue until the ringing of the bell, they generally occupied 16 to 18 pages of *Hansard*. Having got that, I then counted the number of pages devoted to questions on each of the sitting days. I have not added them up, but there were almost always at least 14 pages. In fact, I can see in the list I have prepared only three days on which there were less than 14 pages for questions—one day of 10 pages, one of nine pages and one of seven pages.

Mr. Broomhill: What does this mean?

Mr. McKee: It means that the Opposition is doing its job.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am explaining the way in which this Parliament has been at fault in many ways; it has deteriorated in the way in which it has conducted its business.

Mr. McKee: It is up to the Speaker, now!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think most honourable members will agree with me. It is only some members who want to find ground for disagreement who will not. I believe that members opposite will agree with me in what I am saying at the moment.

Mr. Broomhill: Not about questions, surely?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Probably, many of the questions are too long and the answers are too long. Certainly, the questions are too numerous. We could easily reduce Question Time without in any way inhibiting the rights of members. I mean that questions

should be reduced not by Standing Orders or anything like that but merely by custom, without in any way inhibiting members' rights. I did some other research. During the debate on the Address in Reply I jotted down, or had other members at times jot down, the times the speeches took. I am subject to correction of a minute or two either way here and there, but this is an honest attempt to give the times taken by speakers. Members of the Government Party took these times with their speeches:

Member	Time	
	Hours	Minutes
Gumeracha (mover)	1	10
Onkaparinga	1	12
Stirling		48
Burra		30
Chaffey		43
Rocky River		58
Eyre	1	32
Light		50
Yorke Peninsula		58
Victoria		45

Members opposite took the following times:

Member	Time	
	Hours	Minutes
Leader of the Opposition	1	5
Hindmarsh	1	48
Wallaroo	2	35
Edwardstown	1	41
Gawler		56
Whyalla	1	24
Mount Gambier	2	17
Adelaide	1	2
Semaphore	2	13
Port Pirie	1	2
West Torrens		44
Frome	1	43
Unley		42
Enfield	1	17

I am not certain that the figures I have given are the only ones I took into account in finding the average. At that time the debate on the Address in Reply had not been finished, but I took the average of the times then available. The average length of speech for the House in the Address in Reply debate was 1 hr. 15 mins. The Liberal and Country Party members averaged 57 minutes—18 minutes under the average. The Australian Labor Party members averaged 1 hr. 28 mins.—13 minutes over the average. I use these figures not to start any arguments or anything like that but to point out to the member for Adelaide that, before a person throws bricks and criticizes everybody else, it is better for him to be sure that he is all right himself. I think most members will agree that speeches in this House have tended to be too long and that interjections are too numerous and, occasionally, too rude and designed merely to interrupt and divert rather than to seek information.

Mr. Clark: But they do lengthen the speeches.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. We cannot afford the luxury of the tiresome type of oratory to which we have been subjecting ourselves. Although we are supposed to be leading this State, we often hang around listening to unconstructive comments taken to wearying degrees. I believe that this motion is good and that it must improve the standard of debate. It will in no way inhibit the rights of members or, indirectly, the rights of the electors, in stipulating a limit. Incidentally, this brings our procedures more into line with the practice in other parts of Australia and in other countries where this limit was forced on Parliaments long before it has been forced on us.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I must confess that the most disappointing thing that I found when I came to this House was the length of debate. I must qualify that by saying that this was most disappointing because of the nature of the debate which was caused mainly by the seemingly endless repetition in speeches. Like many other people with my background, I was trained at a school where the principal used to insist that it did not matter so much what one talked about so long as one talked about a quarter of an hour. I believe that is good sense and wise advice. Surely the originality of most men on most subjects can be confined to one hour and, although I am not prepared to say at this moment who are the members that I admire on both sides as the best speakers, the best leaders in debate, I can honestly say that they are the men who make the shortest speeches. I believe that it is the member that can get up, say concisely and precisely what he wants to say, outline his thoughts clearly, and illustrate his arguments, who is the most impressive in debate.

Mention has been made of repetition and, when I think of debates such as the one on Scientology, I think only of endless repetition, and I could refer to scores of similar debates. When a speaker knows only too well that he can wander on, that he can answer interjections, that there is no hurry, that there is no set standard, that there is no time limit, it seems to me that such conditions encourage him to wander and continue to repeat himself. It seems that interjections tend to rewind the member, even though often he may have almost concluded his speech. Having been re-enthused, a member may go on and on, and this results in much endless repetition.

One thing that seems rather important to me is the opinions expressed by people in the gallery. At times many members have their wives sitting in the gallery, and some of us must admit that our wives are our severest critics. People who have been sitting in the gallery often refer to a member and say, "If he had said that in half the time, or even less, we would have been much more impressed." I believe that goes for all of us.

Mr. Nankivell: Fair go!

Mr. WARDLE: This includes the member for Albert and the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Some of my speeches are the shortest in *Hansard*.

Mr. WARDLE: I was about to say that, if I were asked to name the members who had impressed me most, the members for Albert and the Leader of the Opposition would be high on the list, and I wish they had not interjected. But this only proves how interjections can encourage a speaker to continue, because I had intended to finish ere this. Having almost (but not quite) completed my speech before the interjections were made, I point out that, of all the hundreds of people who pass through Parliament House, practically every person who listens to a debate from the gallery will say, "Well, it was almost a waste of time. While so much was said, very little was said in the amount of time that should have been taken to say it." I wholeheartedly support the motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I will not look at the clock, because, in view of what has been said, this may be my last opportunity to exceed the time limit to which the Minister of Lands referred this afternoon.

Mr. Rodda: He made a good speech.

Mr. HUGHES: That is open to debate. I sincerely hope the remarks made by the Minister of Lands are heeded by the member for Victoria because, if any man is responsible for long speeches in this House, it is the member for Victoria.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Don't be modest.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not being modest. I said that the member for Victoria was responsible for long speeches, not that he made them.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many speeches and they are all taking too long.

Mr. HUGHES: This is why speeches in this House take so long, Mr. Speaker, for, as you know, the interjections that come from Government members prolong debates. I have been guilty at times of speaking in this House for over two hours, when what I wanted to

say could easily have been said in less than one hour. However, because members opposite are often absent from the Chamber, gradually drift back, and then wish to refer to a point I have already made, I have to go over it all again for their edification. Before they start throwing stones, Government members should put their own house in order. I wholeheartedly support the motion and agree with what the Minister of Lands has said, although no doubt this will surprise him. Many speeches that have been made in this House could have been just as constructive, and would perhaps have been listened to more intently, if the time taken to make them had been halved. However, it is always the interjections that are made, seeking knowledge—

Mr. Corcoran: And they are out of order.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes; nevertheless, members like to give knowledge to those who require it, and that is why we usually try to answer the interjections made by members opposite. I can see that a much tighter rein will have to come from the Chair in future to allow members to have their remarks recorded in *Hansard*. If there is going to be a continual haggles, as there has been in the past, from members opposite who continue to interject, the member on his feet will have to ignore their remarks and, with your aid, Sir, we shall be able to continue the debate. I have been an offender (I do not deny that), but I have merely wished to say things in the House on behalf of the people I represent. I certainly hope I will have the opportunity to do this in future, even though I may have to do it in half the time.

Reference has correctly been made this afternoon to filibustering, and neither Party can deny that this has occurred. It has occurred in the past to enable certain Government members to attend functions. Without reflecting on any person or Party, I recall one evening when a certain member spoke from the front bench for about three hours, simply filibustering, because there were insufficient numbers to have a vote taken on the measure before the House.

Knowing that this motion will be carried, because I believe it is receiving the support of most members, I think that it will be the Government's responsibility in the future to ensure that it has its members in the House and that they are not gallivanting about outside. While Parliament is sitting this is where those members belong; and, while the business of the House is being conducted, they should be here either to take part or to listen to what is being said. In closing, I sincerely hope that,

in future, Ministers themselves will heed what the Minister of Lands has said this afternoon and will not give such long replies to questions. No-one is more guilty of taking excessive time than are the present occupants of the front bench.

Motion carried.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) moved:

That proposed new Standing Order No. 143A, as adopted by this House, be laid before the Governor by the Speaker for approval pursuant to section 55 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1965.

Motion carried.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a board to assign names to geographical features of South Australia and to exercise certain other powers, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to establish a Geographical Names Board having authority to assign names to geographical features of South Australia. From the time of the first settlement in 1836 until 1916 no body in South Australia was vested with authority to deal with the nomenclature of places and geographical features. Early explorers named geographical features encountered upon their journeys and, as trigonometrical and topographical surveys followed, these names were shown on published maps. However, no co-ordinating authority existed to examine nomenclature in order to avoid duplication and confusion in the assignment of names and places, and to record the sources and origins of place names.

In 1916, following a resolution of the House of Assembly "that in the opinion of this House the time has now arrived when the names of all towns and districts in South Australia which indicate a foreign enemy origin should be altered and that such places should be designated by names of British origin or South Australian native origin", a nomenclature committee of three members was established and given statutory powers by the Nomenclature Act of 1917. This Act was repealed in 1935. The committee had not been vested with general powers over nomenclature, but only

with power to deal with the names of towns and districts whose names were of enemy origin. However, the committee has continued to operate under departmental arrangement in an advisory capacity to the Minister of Lands, who is vested with certain powers over nomenclature under the Crown Lands Act.

Notwithstanding the continued operation of a nomenclature committee in an advisory capacity, there is a definite need in this State for a representative independent authority having power to act as an arbiter in determining place names and to exercise control over all aspects of nomenclature in the State. Since the foundation of this State, with a short lived exception based on purely patriotic grounds, there has not been an authority with statutory powers capable of dealing with all aspects of nomenclature, and it is a matter of regret that no comprehensive official record has been made of place names used in this State, and that the origin of many names used by early explorers and surveyors is not known.

An important and immediate advantage arising from the enactment of the legislation would be that legally binding suburb names could be brought into force. This would prevent a confused situation arising in which land subdividers assign "estate" names to comparatively small areas, thus creating a multiplicity of names that can cause confusion in the minds of the public. An important feature of the Bill is that it provides an avenue for objection to names that the board proposes to assign to geographical features. The right to object does not exist under the Crown Lands Act, and this provision will therefore ensure that public interest in nomenclature can be effectively expressed. The board is also empowered to seek assistance from outside experts in the performance of its powers and functions.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is merely formal. Clause 2 deals with interpretation. The only significant definition is that assigned to the word "place", which is defined as including any geographical or topographical feature, any region, area, locality, city, suburb, town, township, settlement, railway station, hospital, school, and any other place or building that is or is likely to be of public or historical interest. Clause 3 establishes the board, which is to consist of the Surveyor-General, the Chief Draftsman in the Department of Lands, the Curator of Anthropology in the Museum Department or his nominee, the State Librarian or his nominee, the Director of Planning or his

nominee, and the nominee of the Local Government Association.

Clause 4 deals with the procedure at meetings of the board. Clause 5 provides that the board may act notwithstanding any vacancy in its membership, and exempts its members from liability. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of a secretary to the board. Clause 7 provides that the board may with the approval of the Minister seek the assistance of outside persons in the exercise and discharge of its powers and duties. Clause 8 provides that the suburbs of the metropolitan area are, subject to alteration under the Act, to have the names assigned to them on the map referred to in that clause.

Clause 9 provides for the advertisement of proposed geographical names and the manner of objection thereto. Clause 10 provides that the Minister may publish notice of a proposed geographical name recommended by the board in the *Government Gazette*, whereupon the name recommended shall become the geographical name of the place mentioned in the notice. Clause 11 provides for the board to make historical investigations into the names of places. Clause 12 requires the board to publish, from time to time, a gazetteer of geographical names. Clause 13 deals with delegation by the board.

Clause 14 creates offences if the geographical name of a place is misrepresented. Clause 15 provides that names of certain specified kinds of place are not to be published as the names of those places without the approval of the board. Clause 16 provides that the Act does not affect any legal liability existing under any instrument or agreement. Clause 17 provides that the Act is not to apply to the names of municipalities, districts or wards constituted under the Local Government Act, electoral districts, divisions or subdivisions, any road or street, or any other place or type or kind of place exempted by proclamation from the provisions of the Act.

Clause 18 requires the board to report annually on its activities. Clause 19 deals with appropriation. Clause 20 provides for the summary disposal of offences and provides that proceedings for offences are not to be commenced without the approval of the Minister. Clause 21 empowers the Governor to make regulations.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE AUSTRALIAN BOY SCOUTS ASSOCIATION, SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BRANCH, BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Boy Scouts Association, South Australian Branch, Incorporation Act, being a private Act of the year 1940, and to enact other provisions relating to the boy scout movement in South Australia. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

I give this explanation in the presence of my old scoutmaster (the Leader of the Opposition), and I would do less than justice to the association if I did not say that. This is a Bill to amend and consolidate the private Act of the year 1940, intituled the Boy Scouts Association, South Australian Branch, Incorporation Act following the granting by Her Majesty the Queen on August 3, 1967, of a Royal Charter incorporating the Australian Boy Scouts Association and declaring the South Australian association, along with the branches in the other Australian States, to be first branches of the Australian body. The South Australian branch was first created as an oversea branch of the Boy Scouts Association incorporated in the United Kingdom by Royal Charter in 1912.

I feel sure that it is unnecessary for me to explain at length the aims of the boy scout movement which are so well known but which in short are the building of character, and the making of good citizens of our boys, or to explain the value of the excellent training they receive, or the value of this splendid association which exists throughout the British Commonwealth, and is in fact world-wide. The South Australian branch is linked up with the movement throughout the rest of the world through the Australian Association to the Boy Scouts World Bureau. From a small beginning in 1909 the scout movement has over the years steadily developed in South Australia, in common with the other States of the Commonwealth, until at the present time it is a very widespread, well respected, and stable organization with a membership in South Australia of over 17,000 in about 153 groups in the metropolitan area and about 112 groups in the country.

The movement here enjoys the support of a great many prominent citizens who act as officers and members of the branch council and its committees or as representatives of the branch on the national council of the Australian

association. His Excellency the Governor-General is the Chief Scout of Australia and the State Governors act as Chief Scouts of the various State branches. Mr. H. W. Rymill, C.B.E., has been Chief Commissioner of the branch since 1936 and Mr. Alex Ramsay, C.B.E., is the present President of the branch and Chairman of its committees. The Bill provides for the repeal of the 1940 Act and for the re-enactment of its provisions with some amendments, and enacts some further provisions designed to establish the South Australian branch of the Boy Scouts Association on a proper footing now that it has become a branch of the newly incorporated Australian association, and has ceased to be under the direction of the headquarters of the movement in London.

Because of the somewhat complex nature of the proposed amendments to the Act of 1940, it was considered that the better course would be to introduce an amending and consolidating Bill containing the existing provisions as proposed to be amended as well as the new provisions required. That has been done. I think it would assist honourable members to understand the main object and purposes of the Bill if I were at this stage to trace the history of the organization in this State from its inception up to the present time. The Boy Scouts Association was founded in the United Kingdom in 1908 by the late Lieutenant-General, Sir Robert Baden-Powell (afterwards Lord Baden-Powell), famous in history for his defence of Mafeking during the Boer War and who was at one time Chief Scout of the world. The movement commenced in South Australia in the following year in the form of scout patrols of boys into whose hands had come copies of Baden-Powell's book *Scouting for Boys*. The principles of scouting, as founded by Sir Robert Baden-Powell and as embodied in this book and in the scout promise and the scout law, are still and will continue to be the basic principles of the scout movement in Australia and other British communities throughout the world.

In 1912, to promote and facilitate the work of the organization in the United Kingdom and throughout the British Dominions, the Boy Scouts Association was incorporated by Royal Charter and granted power to form local branches in all parts of the Dominions. Following the granting of the charter and a visit to South Australia by Sir Robert Baden-Powell, the movement was properly organized in South Australia and the headquarters in London granted it a constitution under

the name of The Boy Scouts Association (Incorporated by Royal Charter) South Australian Branch. The organization was to be governed by a State council and a State executive committee. In 1934 a new constitution was adopted by the State council pursuant to powers conferred on it by the then existing constitution.

In 1927 imperial headquarters of the association had advised its oversea branches that it was advisable for those branches, which had not then obtained a local ordinance of incorporation to do so, to protect their legal status. Eventually in 1940, it was considered that at its then stage of development it was highly desirable that the movement in South Australia should become incorporated in order to protect its interests and to enable it to hold its properties and possessions (consisting of a valuable city property and other lands, troop meeting halls and camp sites and various stocks and funds) in its corporate name instead of in the names of various sets of individual trustees, which at times had caused unnecessary difficulties in making title. The local branch had been advised many years before by the late Mr. Justice A. W. Piper when he was at the Bar that, as the association was incorporated in England by the Royal Charter, the local branch could not properly be incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act of South Australia. Accordingly, following precedents set in New South Wales (in 1928) and Victoria (in 1932) the 1940 Act was passed, incorporating the local branch under the name of the Boy Scouts Association (Incorporated by Royal Charter) South Australian Branch. The result was (and that was the main object of the Act) that the branch was enabled to hold property and take legal proceedings for the protection of its property and name in its corporate name without the necessity of recourse to individual trustees.

Since the passing of the 1940 Act further properties have been acquired, such as lands, troop meeting halls, and camp sites. In particular I should mention the very fine property of 115 acres recently purchased in the Adelaide Hills and known as "Woodhouse", which was acquired as a boy scouts war memorial camping ground and officer training site. On December 15, 1958, the Australian Boy Scouts Association, by agreement between the British association and the Australian State branches, was formed as a branch of the British association to promote unity of purpose throughout Australia and enable the State branches to act in concert. The Australian

association was however to be completely autonomous and independent; and the State branches became branches of the Australian association subject in all matters relating to policy and scouting to the direction and control of the Australian body, and ceased to be in respect of such matters under the control and direction of imperial headquarters.

Thus the Australian association became the successor to the British association in respect of the State branches; and the movement in Australia was then required to function in accordance with the rules set out in the policy, organization and rules, from time to time published by the Australian association. Subsequently, upon the petition of the then members of the council of the Australian association, Her Majesty the Queen on August 23, 1967, by Royal Charter, ordained that the Australian Boy Scouts Association should be a body corporate and declared "the Boys Scouts Association, South Australian Branch", along with the branches in the other Australian States, to be first branches of the newly incorporated Australian association.

Among other things the charter provides that nothing therein is to prejudice or adversely affect any existing right of any existing branch in respect of name, property or otherwise under the laws of its respective Australian State. Recently on June 27, 1968, the State council of the South Australian branch acting under powers conferred by its constitution and the Act of 1940 adopted a new constitution designed in the main: (1) to meet the new situation where the local branch has finally and conclusively ceased to be under the direction of the British association and has become a branch of the Australian association; (2) to increase the size of the council by adding to the number of lay member supporters of the movement; (3) to facilitate and expedite the work of the executive committee by reducing the number of its members and transferring some of the duties previously performed by it to a newly constituted standing committee in turn responsible to the branch council; and (4) generally to facilitate the smooth working of the movement in South Australia and the Northern Territory, in respect of which the control of the movement has been entrusted to the South Australian branch by the Australian association. Under the new constitution, the governing body hitherto known as "the State council" becomes "the branch council", and provision is made for changing the name of the branch to "The Australian Boy Scouts Association, South Australian Branch" on the enactment of the present Bill.

The new Act is being asked for to establish the local branch on a proper footing so as to enable it to continue to control the scout movement in South Australia and maintain an efficient organization in order to promote the objects and purposes of the Australian Boy Scouts Association. The principal new provisions contained in the Bill are as follows: In the preamble it is recognized that the Boy Scouts Association, South Australian Branch, originally an overseas branch of the British Boy Scouts Association, is now a branch of the Australian Boy Scouts Association incorporated by the Royal Charter granted by Her Majesty the Queen on August 23, 1967. The branch is to continue in existence as a body corporate without change of corporate identity but is renamed the Australian Boy Scouts Association, South Australian Branch, that is, by including the word "Australian" in its name.

The Bill also provides that the members of the branch council, which is the governing body of the branch, shall so long as they remain such members constitute the branch and goes on to state the usual consequences of incorporation such as having perpetual succession, a common seal, etc. It is to be noted that the incorporated body is no longer referred to as "the corporation" which is the designation appearing in the Act of 1940 but as "the branch", which is the designation used in the new constitution of the branch adopted on June 27, 1968. Clause 5 gives the branch power to formulate its own constitution and provides the necessary machinery. This was considered advisable to meet the position where the branch is no longer under the direction and control of the British association and the Royal Charter of 1967 does not give the Australian association power to prescribe constitutions for the State branches previously formed.

Clause 6 confers on the branch power to change its name or alter the designation "Boy Scout". This is particularly designed to enable the branch to follow the example of the Australian association should it decide to follow the British association which has changed its name to the "Scout Association". The remaining provisions re-enact with some slight modifications provisions of the 1940 Act, as follows: clause 7 provides that the branch shall continue to control the boy scout movement in South Australia and confers on it the powers necessary for that purpose. I wish to mention here that the branch also administers the branch formed in the Northern Territory under powers delegated by Australian headquarters. Clause 3 (2), while not conferring any direct

power on the branch to do this, permits the branch to do this if so authorized by the Australian association.

Clause 8 enables the branch to gain title to property held or deemed to be held on trust for it or the association and provides the necessary machinery. This provision is perhaps not so important as it was at the time of the passing of the 1940 Act, when scout property was held in the names of trustees. It is, however, considered advisable to retain the provisions. Clause 9 provides for the mode of dealing with or disposing of property vested in the branch, and prescribes special conditions to be observed in the case of a mortgage or sale.

Clause 13 provides that falsely pretending to be a boy scout or member or officer of the association or of the branch or to be connected therewith is an offence. Clause 14 provides that it shall be an offence without the authority of the branch to wear or sell any boy scout uniform, emblem or badge. In each case the penalty is increased to a maximum of \$50. The increase is to make up for the depreciation in the value of money since 1940. Other clauses relate to the method of dealing by the branch with grants in aid, to the registration with the Registrar of Companies of any further charter or change in the constitution, to the common seal of the branch, and to the mode of giving of notice to the branch. As this Bill is in the nature of a hybrid Bill it is recommended that it be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Fence Act, 1946-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to increase the subsidy payable by the Government to the Dog Fence Board. Section 31 of the principal Act provides for a \$1 for \$1 subsidy for all rates levied by the board up to a maximum of 20c a square mile of ratable land. The amendment removes this limitation and provides that the subsidy payable will be in respect of all rates levied without limitation.

Because of increasing costs, the board is finding difficulty in meeting its commitments and, in fact, is showing a deficit on its operations and, if the amendment is agreed to, it will have the effect of restoring the position to what it was before 1953 when the limitation of the amount of Government subsidy was provided for by way of a proviso to section 31 of the principal Act as it then stood. This amendment is provided for in clause 7. The remaining clauses are formal or make appropriate amendments consequential on the introduction of the system of decimal currency. At present, lessees of ratable land pay 35c a square mile, and this Bill provides for an increase of the subsidy to that figure.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Land Settlement Act, 1944, which constituted a Parliamentary committee on land settlement, provided that the committee would operate for about five years, that is, until December, 1949. Since that time, by a succession of amending Acts, the life of the committee has been extended by two-yearly intervals and the last of such extensions will expire on December 31 this year. By the Land Settlement Act Amendment Act, 1948, the committee was given power to recommend the acquisition of land in the western division of the South-East, either by agreement or by compulsory process. This power was expressed to be exercisable for nine years from the passing of the 1944 amending Act, but the time within which this power is exercisable has also been extended to accord with the extensions of the life of the committee.

Section 4 (2) of the principal Act provides that two members of the committee shall be members of the Legislative Council and five members shall be members of the House of Assembly. By custom, one of the members appointed from the Legislative Council has been a member of the Party led by the Leader of the Government and one has been a member of the Party led by the Leader of the

Opposition. This custom was, by implication, adverted to in an amendment to the principal Act in 1965 by the Statutes Amendment (Industries Development and Land Settlement Committees) Act, 1965, when it was thought desirable to make provision for the situation when one or other of the Parties represented in the Legislative Council did not have a member available for appointment. The effect of that amendment was that when the Governor was formally apprised of this situation he would be empowered to appoint six members from the House of Assembly and one member from the Legislative Council.

However, when the question of extending the life of the committee past December of this year arose it was apparent that the situation would need examination. Under the previous system of extending the life of the committee by merely extending the terms of office of the members in office, there would be no way of altering the composition of the committee back to its five House of Assembly and two Legislative Council representatives until a member from the House of Assembly vacated his office, since in the terms of the Act there is no provision for such a member being required to vacate his office to restore normal representation. As the position now stands, there is a six Assembly and one Legislative Council representation when the need for that type of representation is long past.

Accordingly, in this Bill it is proposed that (a) the life of the committee will be extended for four years, that is, until December 31, 1973, any further extensions after that time being within the province of future Parliaments; (b) on December 31 this year all members in office will go out of office and future members will be appointed for a two-year term; and (c) whenever the Governor is required to make an appointment to the committee an opportunity will be provided for appropriate representation to be made by the President of the Legislative Council in the light of the composition of the Parties in that House. This should ensure that after such appointments the representation by Houses of Parliament reflects the current situation.

I will now deal with the Bill in some detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out a formal expiry date for the measure. Clause 3 sets out in detail the mode of advising the Governor of the availability of members of the Legislative Council for appointment and directs the exercise of the Governor's powers of

appointment in this regard. Clause 4 provides for the vacation of office of members, appointments for two-year terms thereafter, and for the terms of members appointed to fill casual vacancies. Clauses 5 to 8 effect certain amendments consequent on the adoption of a system of decimal currency. Clause 9 provides that the power to recommend acquisition of land in the South-East may be exercised for the duration of the life of the Act. Clauses 10 and 11 effect decimal currency amendments.

Mr. BURDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 2239.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill. As the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition said last night, this State has looked forward to this legislation for a long time. Notwithstanding what the Leader said about his Party's principles, I believe that the Bill, when it becomes law, will give some balance to Parliamentary representation that will be good for South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: But not complete balance.

Mr. RODDA: I do not want to canvass what the Leader said and what I am being prodded into by the honourable member. I believe this is a matter for the respective Parties and their policies. This redivision of boundaries will afford the Leader and his Party the opportunity to go out and espouse their cause, just as it will afford such an opportunity for the people whose philosophies I represent in this Parliament. With the build-up of population in the metropolitan area, I believe that metropolitan members were little fish swimming in big pools. I have some sympathy for the metropolitan member who has been trying to represent about 50,000 people; his must be a hazardous task.

Of course, some country members are giving ground and taking on more ground. We do this in a generous way, and it is on this issue that we do not see eye to eye with the Labor Party's principles. Be that as it may, the representation that will come about through the good compromise that this Bill represents will give each Party an opportunity to win an election on its merits. This will remove the stigma of a gerrymander that has been tacked on to the Party of which I have the honour to be a member. I say that in all sincerity.

It will now behove both Parties to legislate and come up with policies that are good for South Australians, and I believe that all members have this aim sincerely in their hearts. We are all kicking for the same goal, but perhaps from different directions.

There are things in this Bill that I do not like. I had to give some ground, just as the Leader said his Party did. I am sure the Bill will be passed and that we will have an election for a new Parliament on new boundaries. We have thought about such a new Parliament, but I am sure we have not fully realized exactly what it will be like; virtually half the members will be new to Parliament. Some of us may not be here, but I am sure that those of us who do return will be only too pleased to assist the new members.

Mr. McKee: You sound confident.

Mr. RODDA: I believe that all of us have our heads on the block. If I am amongst those who will come here as ex-members I shall be only too pleased to wish everyone well. This Bill will be good for South Australia, for it will put everyone on his mettle to have a policy and a story to tell.

The SPEAKER: Under Standing Orders, an amendment to the Constitution Act requires the Speaker to count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Amendment of Second Schedule to principal Act."

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I move:

In paragraph (b) to strike out "Mallee" and insert "Ridley".

The reason for my simple amendment is that the name "Ridley" has been associated with this district for 35 years since an earlier amendment to the Constitution Act. The name has been accepted by the people in the district, and I have had many telephone calls from people in the present district of Ridley and from people along the Pinnaroo line who will be electors in the proposed new district to tell me that they are not very happy with this proposed name. Those people have asked me to move an amendment to preserve the name "Ridley".

In the evidence placed before the electoral commission the name "Ridley" was recommended by me and by the Australian Labor Party. When the commission presented its findings to me I made a press statement that the commission, overall, had done a magnificent job but that I was disappointed that it had recommended the name "Mallee". The commission's reasoning was difficult to follow, because it had said that we should revere the names of prominent people who had played an important part in South Australia's history, and it recommended their names for many districts. For example, the name "Playford" refers to the previous Liberal Premier and his grandfather, who were associated with public life in this State over many years. The name "Peake" refers to a Premier of South Australia whose photograph hangs in this magnificent Chamber. The name "Price" refers to the Hon. Thomas Price, who was a prominent, renowned and revered Labor Premier. The name of Sir Ross Smith and his feats are renowned not only in South Australia but throughout the world. Further, one district has been named "Heysen", after Sir Hans Heysen, the noted artist. The name of Mawson has also been recommended, and Sir Douglas Mawson has been associated with South Australia. Many of the suggested names of districts are the names of persons who have gained world-wide prominence.

I think it only reasonable to express my disappointment that the same principle has not been adopted by the commission in regard to retaining the name of Ridley. Nearly 90 per cent of the persons in the proposed new district are engaged in the production of wheat, barley or oats. It was Ridley who invented the harvester-stripper in South Australia. When the Constitution Act was altered in 1938, the name of Ridley was adopted for the district, on the recommendation of the commissioners, because of Ridley's association with the harvester-stripper.

It surprises me that, in nearly all the other districts, the commission has adopted the principle of perpetuating these names. The names of Frome, Eyre, Stuart and Flinders have been retained to revere the names of people who have played a prominent part in the history of South Australia. It is true that "Mallee" is the Aboriginal name for the short eucalypt tree, but it is not a name that would enhance the prestige of the district, and many people who attended the Loxton show last Monday were opposed to the adoption of that name for their district.

Of course, "Mallee" is an electoral district in the Commonwealth Parliament, being in the northern part of the Mallee area of Victoria. However, I know that many people in Victoria and in Canberra are not pleased with this name. I recommend that the Committee retain the name of Ridley. I have moved my amendment not for personal aggrandizement in connection with my own representation of this district but to carry out the principle that the commission has adopted in nearly every other case. The name of Ridley is sound for the reasons that I have given, and I hope that the Committee sees fit to accept my amendment. This is not an attempt to alter the boundaries: it is an attempt to change the name of the district as many people desire.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I understand the honourable member's feelings about the change of the name of the district that he has represented for so long. However, I point out to him and to the Committee that most members are faced with some change in their districts, whether in relation to boundaries, names, or other features of the areas with which they have been associated, often for many years. I personally had one or two disappointments about changes within the district with which I have been associated. That district has been changed in several ways.

I think we all have to face these difficulties. The changes are widespread because the redistribution has been so long in coming. If in the past we had been able to make more moderate adjustments to districts from time to time, we would not have had such a widespread rearrangement of districts as has been placed before us. I must take some issue with the contention that the commission has maintained the *status quo* for a good many of the districts, because my research shows that 16 former names of districts have been dropped and the districts involved range over a broad section of the country and city areas of South Australia. There is little need for me to name those districts.

The name of the district with which you have been associated for so long, Mr. Chairman, has been dropped. I think that, if we were to make this change and do what the member for Ridley has said is a relatively minor thing, even though there may be good reasons for doing it, other members could advance equally good reasons for making other minor changes and we would then have a large-scale change of names. If we were to make those changes,

I think we would be beginning to undermine the impartial findings of the commission which has, I think, received commendation from both sides of this Chamber.

We realize the difficulties that the commission had in making such a big change and superimposing it on the present situation. Whilst I fully understand the position of the member for Ridley in this matter, I also am concerned about some of the alterations to the district that I have represented. I think most of us are faced with change in some way or another. Therefore, I cannot support an amendment that moves in only one direction but not in the many others that could be to the convenience of other members. I urge the Committee not to accept the amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition put evidence before the commission on all matters that appeared to us relevant for decision, including names. The commission had a job to do in considering district boundaries and proposing names to Parliament, and once we start messing about with the commission's report it is difficult to know where the line is to be drawn. We have given to independent commissioners the job of making a decision. They have made their decision and have made recommendations to Parliament, and I agree with the Premier that these submissions ought not to be interfered with. Once we start altering names, we will be altering many names, and I do not think this is in any way advisable. As the Opposition sticks by the report brought in by the commission, we do not intend to vote for the amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I consider that, perhaps, the member for Ridley has some special cause for regretting that the name of Ridley has been dropped from the list of names of districts that carry names of historic importance to South Australia. However, I consider that that name is well preserved in several other ways in South Australia. The contribution that Ridley made to agriculture is well recognized and probably the name will be quite adequately preserved in ways other than by giving it to an electoral district. I agree entirely with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

In the change from multiple districts to single districts, many alterations were made not only in nomenclature but also in boundaries and the general set-up. In 1955, although I thought that the commission had made

one or two errors of judgment, members of this Chamber decided that, regardless of personal feelings, in the interests of unanimity they would not amend the commission's findings. Following the recent inquiry, about 16 wellknown names have been omitted, and probably new members and particularly the Speaker, will have some problems in remembering all the new district names. However, it would be unwise to alter the commission's recommendations. As a primary producer I, too, pay a tribute to the name of Ridley, but I do not support the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: Sir Lancelot Stirling was President of the Legislative Council for 32 years, and it is unfortunate that this name will not be retained. However, as the new district that embraces the present district of Stirling is adjacent to the town of Stirling much confusion would be caused, and I think we should abide by the commission's decision regarding this and other changes of nomenclature. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am disappointed at the views of the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer and the member for Stirling. Parliament appointed this commission and Parliament, which is a supreme body, has the right to accept, reject, or amend its findings. Although I greatly admire the members of the commission, I think they have not given enough thought to the name "Mallee". The people I represent are not happy about it, and I am doing my duty in suggesting this change. It was inevitable that some names would be omitted because of the change in ratio between metropolitan and country seats, and the commission has tried to adopt the names of people who have been prominently associated with South Australian history. I point out, however, that Bragg is not a good name for an electoral district. It seems that the Committee considers that the commission's findings should not be interfered with, and I accept its decision. With the greatest respect to the commission, I consider that it has not given sufficient thought to the change from Ridley to Mallee.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I move:

In paragraph (b) to strike out "Millicent" and insert "Gordon".

Adam Lindsay Gordon was associated with the South-East for many years: he was a member of this Parliament and his old residence, Dingley Dell, has been preserved by

the National Trust. Millicent is not a good name for that electoral district, because other important towns are in that area. An adequate case has been made out to name the new district Gordon, because he was a world-renowned poet whose exploits in the South-East were well known in Robe, Beachport, Port MacDonnell, Kingston and other places I have mentioned. My amendment follows the commission's principle of selecting the names of prominent people for new electoral districts. What better name could there be for this district than the name of one of its most renowned poets, known all over the world for his exploits as a dashing horseman? I am disappointed that the commission did not see fit to call this district Gordon, and I recommend that that name be adopted by the Committee.

Mr. CORCORAN: A few minutes ago the member for Ridley was complaining that the commission had changed the name of an electoral district; now he himself seeks to change the name of another. He is not consistent. "Millicent" was the name of my electoral district prior to the redistribution of boundaries and the commission's recommendations, and it has seen fit to leave the name as it is. I agree that Adam Lindsay Gordon enjoys world-wide fame as one who did much to put the South-East on the map but, if the commission had changed the name of Millicent, the people of Millicent and the surrounding district would have been bitterly opposed to that. At the last Millicent election and by-election the people there were pleased to know that the name was Millicent because they claimed it did much to put not only Millicent but also the South-East in general on the map. Naming a district after its main centre identifies the locality. I hope the Committee will not accept this amendment. The commission has seen fit to retain the name of Millicent and no other Party has made any submission in this regard.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In my submissions to the commission I recommended the name "Gordon".

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The SPEAKER: As this is a constitutional amendment, it is necessary under Standing Order No. 300 for the Speaker to count the

House before the question for the third reading is put. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes of the proposed new clause 6a of the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 2252.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): In supporting the second reading of this Bill, I want first to make two points about co-operation. I have just asked what time the House will adjourn this afternoon and have been told "half-past five".

Mr. Virgo: Are you going to speak as long as that?

Mr. HUGHES: I can speak until 6 p.m. and after that if necessary. The Opposition has been most considerate in co-operating with members opposite, and I think I am justified in saying what I am saying without the Attorney-General getting all het up over it. I approached the Government Whip and the Premier night after night, before the Minister of Roads and Transport saw fit to cancel the rail service to Wallaroo. I was able to catch a railcar at 6.5 p.m. because the House used to adjourn before 6 p.m. Ever since the railway service was cancelled, it has been necessary for me to stay in Adelaide another night, with added expense, because the road bus leaves at 5.30 p.m. The Labor Party is being most co-operative with the Government in assisting it to get through this House legislation considered of great benefit to the whole community, yet it has been charged by the Attorney-General more than once with doing everything it can do to frustrate the Government in having legislation passed. I remind the Attorney-General that only last evening the Opposition co-operated with him in regard to amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, these amendments not being acceptable to the Attorney. We also supported him in respect of the Legislative Council's amend-

ments to that Bill that were acceptable to him. In addition, members on this side fully co-operated with the Government last evening in respect of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, which was introduced after the dinner adjournment.

I have always strongly supported expediting the passage of legislation that I have thought will benefit the State. This applies to the Bill considered last evening, even though the name of Wallaroo as it applies to my district will be dispensed with. The Attorney-General has often charged the Leader of the Opposition, particularly when the Leader was Premier, with not being able to draft a Bill and with having to introduce many amendments. Indeed, the Attorney-General is agreeing with me at the moment. However, on this small Bill, the Attorney-General has one full page of amendments on honourable members' files. He should look in the mirror and think of the times when he has accused the Leader of the Opposition in this respect. He should realize that it is often considered necessary to draft amendments to a measure in order to improve it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in order in referring to amendments at this stage.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not discussing amendments, Mr. Speaker: I am making passing references to them. I do not intend to transgress either Standing Orders or your ruling. However, I draw members' attention to the fact that the Attorney-General has charged the Leader of the Opposition more than once with doing exactly what the Attorney is now doing. I do not think the Attorney-General was genuine when he accused the Leader in regard to his drafting of measures. The Bill, if passed (as I sincerely hope it will be), will place on the Statute Book a principle which, in my opinion, is long overdue. Many people have been criminally assaulted in the past and, when the time has come for them to claim compensation for injuries sustained, they have not been able to do so.

Mr. McKee: Sometimes, these people have been in the process of helping the police carry out their duties.

Mr. HUGHES: Although I cannot cite such a case, I accept what the honourable member says. I do not doubt that this has occurred in the past and that the people concerned have

sustained injuries for which they have not been able to claim any compensation. Often, when a person is unfortunate enough to receive physical injury as a result of violence, the person responsible for that violence, when apprehended, is found to be in such financial circumstances that it is impossible for the person who has received the injury to get just compensation to pay the doctors' and hospital bills involved. As it stands, the Bill provides some relief to people who sustain injury in these circumstances. The maximum sum provided in the Bill is \$1,000, which is not much when one considers what is involved in doctors' bills. Unfortunately, in some cases, hospital bills also have to be met. Nevertheless, some relief, although not enough, will be provided.

As the Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation, this is a start, and it is hoped that in the future there will be an increase in the sum provided. I should like to have seen a much larger sum provided at this juncture. Anyone who has had to pay doctors' and hospital bills as a result of sustaining physical injury knows what is involved. Also, absence from work may result in a consequent loss in wages. In some cases, \$1,000, which is the maximum provided (and not everyone will receive the maximum), will not go far. As I agree with the suggestion made by the member for Millicent that the maximum should be about \$10,000, I hope the Government will shortly heed that suggestion. A sum of \$10,000 would be more just than the \$1,000 provided in the Bill. Not everyone who receives an injury and makes a claim will be paid. When a claim is made, an investigation will be carried out by some responsible person.

Mr. Jennings: The amount to be received will be assessed.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Someone will have to say "Yea" or "Nay" whether the person involved should be paid anything, and the sum to be paid will have to be assessed. In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General said that the Bill was designed to provide for people who received physical or mental injury. First, I will deal with physical injury. Of late, some young people, for no apparent reason at all, have been ill-treated or, to use a present-day term, beaten up.

Mr. Jennings: Bashed.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, that is the word that I think the press would use and perhaps it

is the right word. When that happens, it is easy for a young person to have an arm broken. The people who do the damage usually make sure they get away, so that the person injured is left with a broken arm or perhaps another physical injury that would necessitate his being away from his place of employment. Although some people affected may be covered to a certain extent, they would not necessarily be covered for the whole period they were indisposed. Then, there is the aspect of mental injury, for which much more money should be made available. Some people are very nervous and, if they are bashed, a lasting impression is left on their mental outlook and they can become afraid of the human race. Consequently, \$1,000 would be only a drop in the ocean in respect of meeting their requirements.

Mr. McKee: They may be permanently incapacitated.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. McKee: They may suffer brain damage.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes—and the effect may last for the rest of their lives. It is a pity that these people should become a burden on someone but apparently, whilst the Government is prepared to start something by this Bill, it is not prepared to provide adequately for this type of injury. One of the most glaring things covered by the term "injury" is injury brought about by pregnancy. We all know what the Attorney-General meant in this connection, although the word "rape" is not in the Bill.

We all know of cases where young girls have been offered rides late at night and have foolishly accepted them; they have then been taken to places against their will and raped. This is the worst offence of the lot, because it has a tragic effect on the future life of the girl concerned. It remains in her memory for the rest of her life. I would have liked to see the Government make additional provision for this type of case. The Government should perhaps have provided \$1,000 compensation for physical injuries resulting from violence but it should have been more generous in compensating the type of person I have referred to. Such a person should be so treated that she will be accepted into social life again.

In addition to mental shock, the term "injury" covers nervous shock. Every member knows that this type of shock can affect both young people and elderly people but its effect is perhaps more drastic on people between 16 and 20 years of age. When such people are subjected to violence they can become a real burden on their relatives and on the community as a whole for the rest of their lives. Of course, the Government cannot be held responsible for this type of thing, but I consider that it could have been more liberal in its outlook by making more money available for specialist treatment to enable them to get well again. The Attorney-General, in his explanation of the Bill, mentioned our police officers, and stated:

Section 6 of the Police Offences Act empowers a court to award compensation to a police officer in respect of bodily injury suffered by him in the execution of his duty.

I think it was the Deputy Leader who referred to this matter last evening, and he also referred to the possibility of police officers being able to claim under this Bill as well as under that section of the Police Offences Act. When the Deputy Leader said that, the Attorney-General nodded his head. Is it correct that they could claim under this Bill as well?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: They could get only one lot of compensation. If they did not get anything under the other section, they could use this one.

Mr. HUGHES: That is fair enough. I hold the members of our Police Force in high respect. From my observations, I think we can proudly boast that we have one of the best Police Forces in Australia. I commend the force on its work in all aspects. Doubtless, some people will find fault with anything, and they complain about the Police Force. However, I consider that 99 per cent of the members of the force are honourable men who do the job they are called upon to do. Often their job is not easy. Perhaps in Adelaide or in the metropolitan area it may not be so bad but in country districts they get to know people in the area well and, within an hour of leaving a game of football, cricket or tennis, they may be called on to make an arrest for some misdemeanour committed by a person with whom they have been associated in sport during the afternoon. If police officers that I know were called on to do this, they would do it. This action would take courage, but I am sure that the type of person in the department today would carry out this duty.

I am pleased that officers may receive compensation under these provisions if it is not paid through other avenues.

This Bill will be welcomed by the people of South Australia, as it will convey to the general public that a genuine attempt has been made by the Attorney-General to introduce legislation that will be approved by all members, and that its provisions will operate soon. However, we must not let the matter rest: this amount must be increased. The Attorney-General said that the Government would like to increase the maximum allocation but, because of financial commitments, it was not possible to do so at present. This is the initial stage, and further consideration will be given to providing additional finance when it becomes available. I realize that the Government has to consider seriously the allocation of its finances, but I hope that the individual has been considered first and that financial considerations are secondary. I do not think many people would qualify for compensation under these provisions.

Unless the Attorney-General in Committee can convince me that, because there have been many cases of this sort it would not be advisable to make the maximum more than \$1,000, I think it should be more than that. However, as our Police Force is so alert and efficient, there will not be many occasions on which this kind of compensation will need to be paid, for in nine cases out of 10 the police will soon be at the back door of the offender.

The main point is whether the people who are prosecuted are able to pay this amount of compensation. It is no good having this provision unless they can. We are not so much concerned with the man who gets away, because I do not think that will happen too often, but, when offenders are apprehended and brought before the court, it is no good our laying down the amount of compensation payable if they are not able to pay it. What is the use of a court saying that a man must pay \$1,000 compensation when he has only 30c or 40c in his pocket? It is just too foolish. That is one reason why I maintain that the amount is not enough.

It appears that most people committing this type of offence are not financially well off and so, whilst they may receive a sentence, they have not the money to meet the costs

which the victim has to meet. However, I commend the Attorney-General for introducing this Bill and sincerely hope it will pass. Perhaps next session he will consider increasing the maximum amount of compensation payable.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 21, at 2 p.m.