

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, September 4, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS

#### RAILWAY SERVICES

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleagues and I are concerned about a statement made some time ago by the Minister about discontinuing certain railway services. Some people are wondering whether the Transport Control Board and the Public Works Standing Committee will consider these matters. The Minister was reported as saying that the Public Works Standing Committee would investigate each proposal. On July 31 the Leader of the Opposition, to clarify the matter, asked the Minister a question about closing railway lines (*Hansard*, page 345). On August 13 the Minister, in reply, explained the procedure necessary before railway lines might be closed. I point out that this matter is covered by the Road and Railway Transport Act, which provides that the Transport Control Board is empowered to inquire into the matter and it must refer any order it makes to the Public Works Standing Committee, which must take action within 28 days in regard to that order and then submit a report. In his reply on that date the Minister said:

If a railway line is closed, action is subsequently taken to place a Bill before both Houses of Parliament to dispose of the assets of that line. If Parliament passes such a Bill the line can then be taken up and the assets of that line disposed of. It may help the honourable member if I say that the Railways Commissioner can adjust services on a line without reference to the Transport Control Board or the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. In fact, on the Willunga line only one train a week operates, but this line is not yet closed in a legal sense. To close this line, the procedures I have already outlined will have to follow.

In view of this reply, can the Minister say on what date the Transport Control Board referred the question of closing part of the Dry Creek branch line, which is the subject matter of a Bill now before this Council, to the Public Works Standing Committee and on what date

that committee submitted a report on the matter?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The matter has not been referred to the committee. The honourable member queries the need for this matter to be referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works under the provisions of the Road and Railway Transport Act in respect of closing of lines. This is not a closing of a railway line, but merely altering the terminus of the line a distance of a few chains from one side of Briens Road to the other where the station is situated.

A similar situation arose at Kingston some years ago when the Kingston terminus was moved from the centre of the town to the outskirts. The matter was not referred to the Public Works Committee on that occasion. The essence of an investigation for the closing of a line under the Road and Railway Transport Act is the cessation of services to a particular area. It does not include a matter such as moving a terminus a few chains.

#### BURRA COPPER

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The history of copper mining in Burra goes back to the early days of the State. Recently, Mr. President, during your term of office as Minister of Mines, it was decided to undertake work in this area to see what copper deposits may be there. This exploration work was carried out subsequently during the term of office of the previous Government. During that time, following reports on the availability of low-grade copper, a lease of the area was let to a company conditional on further exploration work being carried out in the area. Can the Minister give a progress report on the further exploration for copper in this area?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Earlier this year several shafts were sunk in the oxidized leavings of the Burra copper mines to obtain a substantial sample of copper lodes for testing. I understand that considerable metallurgical difficulties have been encountered in trying to recover copper from this material. However, the metallurgical investigations are still proceeding. Drilling has taken place for the possibility of deeper-seated copper lodes, but this has stopped at present because of the discouraging results received from the several holes that have been drilled.

**PARA WIRRA NATIONAL PARK**

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture representing the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe all honourable members would appreciate and approve what has been done by succeeding Governments in the development of the Para Wirra National Park. However, I have been told that the fencing around the park is in a very bad condition. I believe that some plans are afoot for this area to be refenced at some future time. However, I am informed that at present parts of the existing fence are in such a condition that kangaroos and other native fauna are able to escape into the paddocks of adjoining landholders and that repairs to the existing fence should be carried out pending its replacement. Will the Minister of Agriculture therefore refer this matter to his colleague and ascertain whether the necessary repairs can be effected?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes.

**CONCESSION RATES**

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Lands, a reply to the question I asked on August 28, regarding the length of time owners must keep sheep transported to and from agistment at concession rates before disposing of them?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My colleague informs me that, for the purposes of concession rates on stock transported to and from agistment, no period has been fixed in the manner described by the honourable member. However, the department would expect that primary producers would conform with the object of the rebate: that is, to assist them to retain their stock. In his question the honourable member asked whether a time limit, as imposed in other States, was fixed here. This State does not impose a time limit in the same way. It is expected, of course, that farmers will play the game in conformity with the object of that rebate.

**PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL**

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

**HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Act, 1935-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*  
From time to time children attending school are found to be infested with head lice. When this is brought to the attention of the parents and their co-operation is obtained, the problem can be resolved effectively. However, in a few though a significant number of cases, parents, either through ignorance or through lack of interest, are unwilling to co-operate with the authorities, thus causing unnecessary discomfort to the children and exposing other children to the risk of infestation. One of the objects of this Bill is, therefore, to provide an appropriate sanction in relation to these recalcitrant parents. At the same time opportunity has been taken to effect some other amendments to the principal Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal, and clause 3 makes certain consequential amendments to the arrangement of the principal Act. Clause 4 amends the definition section of the principal Act by making it clear that the expression "vermin" includes lice and fleas, the scientific descriptions of which are set out in the amendment. Clause 5 makes an amendment consequential on the amendments effected by the Bill to the heading to Part IX. Clause 6 repeals and re-enacts section 131 (1) in substantially the same form, but gives the local board of health the power to deal with vermin-infested premises and articles in the same way as it can at present deal with premises harbouring persons suspected to be suffering from an infectious disease. In addition, the local board is empowered to act on the report of one of its inspectors. The amendment to subsection (2) is consequential on the re-enacted subsection (1).

Clause 7 is a new provision based on section 134 of the principal Act, the present provision relating to persons suffering from infectious diseases, and deals with persons who are infested with vermin, it being aimed at encouraging infested persons to seek appropriate treatment as quickly as possible. Clauses 8 and 9 are consequential on the amendment proposed in clause 7. Clause 10 is self-explanatory and attempts to ensure that a vermin-infested child will be appropriately treated and will not become a source of infestation to others.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Have you ever known a schoolchild to have fleas?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Not personally, no. Clause 11 is intended to resolve a doubt that could arise in connection with the location in the Part of the principal Act dealing with infectious diseases of sections 146 and 146a, which deal with hospitals and rest homes. A view could be taken that these sections were limited to hospitals and rest homes accepting only infectious diseases cases. Since this was clearly not the intention of the principal Act, the amendment should make this clear by placing these sections in a separate Part of the Act. Clause 12 amends section 146 of the principal Act by providing that the fee for a licence for a hospital or rest home shall be fixed by regulation. Previously the fee that could be charged by the local board (\$4) was set out in this section. The present fee, which was fixed in 1936, does not now cover the expenses of the local board in making the inspections, which are a prerequisite for the granting of the licence. It is felt that the fixing of the fee by regulation will provide for some flexibility in this matter. In addition, certain citations in this section of the principal Act have been brought up to date.

Clause 13 makes similar amendments to section 146a of the principal Act, which deals with the licensing of rest homes and in addition excludes from the definition of "rest home" "psychiatric rehabilitation hostels" established under the Mental Health Act. This amendment seems desirable since doubts have been expressed whether such establishments are, on a strict construction of the section, outside the definition. Clauses 14, 15 and 16 deal with developments in the control of tuberculosis. As honourable members are aware, considerable success has been achieved in the control of this disease since the late 1940's but they may not be aware that this State has for many years been regarded as something of a leader in the field. As evidence of this, it was possible some time ago to close down one of our establishments, the Bedford Park Sanatorium, and it is hoped in the not distant future to be able to close the Morris Hospital, leaving the care of sufferers to private institutions, which of course enjoy a substantial measure of indirect Commonwealth support.

However, some minor amendments to Part IVa of the Act, which deals with tuberculosis, will be required. The provisions affected are those dealing with the (happily rare) cases where some compulsion is necessary to ensure that tuberculosis sufferers in an infectious

condition and who provide a risk of infection to others are properly cared for. Clauses 14 and 15 amend the definition of "institution" in relation to which an order for confinement may be made, since upon the closure of the Morris Hospital there will be no establishment in this State that will, strictly speaking, fall within that definition. Clause 16 will permit any patient confined by order of the court in the Morris Hospital to be transferred to some other institution for the balance of the period authorized by the court. Clause 17 is consequential on the amendments made by clauses 12 and 13.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADELAIDE TO GAWLER RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF DRY CREEK TERMINUS) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Roads and Transport): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It enables the South Australian Railways Commissioner to alter the position of the Northfield terminus on the Adelaide to Gawler railway line. Under section 60 of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, an express limitation is placed upon the powers of the Commissioner preventing him from altering the position of any railway terminus. Consequently, when a terminus is to be altered, express legislation is necessary to invest him with the requisite authority. Honourable members will observe on the plan exhibited for their perusal that, under the provisions of the Bill, the terminus, which is at present situated at the point marked "B" on the plan, is to be removed and a new terminus is to be established at the point marked "A". The portion of the railway to be removed is no longer in use and its removal will enable the Highways Department to improve the intersection of Briens Road with South Terrace. I may add that the proposed alteration conforms to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 974.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): This Bill is a small but necessary amendment to the Dairy Cattle Improvement Act. My

colleague the Hon. Mr. Hart gave us much of the history of that Act yesterday and we are indebted to him for his discourse. This Act is aimed at stock improvement and, of course, it refers specifically to dairy cattle. I hasten to say that I believe a tribute should be paid to the Agriculture Department, and particularly the Animal Husbandry and Animal Health Branches of that department, for their assistance in improving stock as is envisaged and provided for in this Act. The aid of the officers of those branches in assisting stud and commercial breeders, not only of cattle but also of sheep and pigs, has been largely instrumental in procuring great improvements over the years in the quality of stock in South Australia. This, of course, is a result of the operation of the principal Act and of other Acts whose provisions are administered by the Agriculture Department and observed by our stud and commercial breeders. Section 6 of the principal Act provides:

(1) A licence is hereby required for every bull over the age of six months . . .

(2) If—

- (a) after the thirty-first day of July in any year, any bull over the age of six months on the first day of the said month is unlicensed; or
- (b) after the thirty-first day of January in any year, any bull over the age of six months on the first day of the said month is unlicensed,

the owner of such bull shall be guilty of an offence against this Act and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds.

The Bill now before the Council deletes paragraphs (a) and (b), which I have just quoted, and substitutes one provision providing for the thirty-first day of July as the birthday of bulls. This amendment is reasonable and I support it, despite what the Minister and the Hon. Mr. Bevan said about taking away bulls' birthdays. Although bulls must be licensed, it is very doubtful whether the bulls themselves will notice any change in the number of birthdays they have, so all this talk about taking away birthdays is a lot of nonsense. I believe, nevertheless, that this amendment is necessary.

The other amendments in this Bill affect sections 10, 13, 14 and 16 of the principal Act. They are either consequential or due to the adoption of decimal currency, and therefore need no further consideration. However, I believe that the object of this legislation should be spelt out more clearly. The principal Act is entitled "Dairy Cattle Improve-

ment Act" and I am also aware of the amendments to it made in 1940 and 1960, to which the Hon. Mr. Hart referred yesterday. Nevertheless, I believe that in the interpretation section, section 4, the word "bull", which is fairly freely used in the Act, should be defined as "a dairy bull" or as "a bull being used in a dairy herd".

In section 4 of the principal Act "inspector", "licence", "owner" and "unlicensed" are defined, but not "bull". It is not defined as being specifically a dairy bull, nor is it mentioned as such in the title of the Act, which could be interpreted as referring to all kinds of bull. Will the Minister consider including in the legislation a proper definition? The amendment foreshadowed by the Hon. Mr. Kemp appears to be a suitable way of dealing with the matter. Subject to the points I have raised, I support the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I support the Bill, and I commend the Minister responsible for it, because it is the first time for some years that we have had a measure before us that changes licence fees but does not increase them. When examining the principal Act I was reminded how the industry with which this Act deals has changed since 1921, when the legislation was first enacted. In that year Adelaide's milk supply was largely drawn from the hundreds of cows in the park lands that were driven daily to dairies in the suburbs and even in the city itself.

In the suburbs in 1921 a person underwent a serious risk if he left his front gate open because he might find a cow chewing its way through the petunias and making a mess in the front garden. I vividly remember a mother wielding a broom and valiantly repelling the invaders, although she was terrified of the creatures. I am sure that this experience would appal the housewife of today if she had to put up with it.

The Dairy Cattle Improvement Act has been one of the cornerstones upon which enormous change and improvement in the industry have been built. In 1921 the dairying industry was important but there were large surpluses until the Paterson scheme relieved the distress experienced in the industry. Except for a small radius around Adelaide the dairying industry was entirely preoccupied with producing butter, cream and a small amount of cheese.

Today, Adelaide's milk supply is drawn from an area covered by a radius of more than 100 miles from Adelaide. Tetrapak milk and ultra-heat treated milk travel from far afield; in fact,

some such milk is sent overseas. We are sending much cheese to Japan, and the public does not generally realize that South Australia must import butter; such has been the increase in the demand for dairy products.

Our dairying industry today is more virile and efficient than that anywhere else in Australia because of the Dairy Cattle Improvement Act and related Acts, which have enabled the devoted officers of the Agriculture Department to lead us so efficiently over the years. Some of these men will live in your memory, Mr. President, and in the memories of other honourable members. I refer particularly to the late Mr. Barlow and to Mr. Suter.

The developments in the dairy industry lead me to point out the need for another amendment to the principal Act. In 1921 the dairying industry was confined largely to the closely settled areas of the State and it was only necessary to confine the operation of the principal Act to dairy cattle in that part of the State. At that time beef cattle were almost a curiosity in the farming districts. They were raised only in the pastoral lands, where the wild dog problem precluded raising sheep. If I can make another historical mention, that was about the time that construction began on the huge dog fence, which today stretches from Queensland across the northern part of South Australia and reaches the coastline in the far Bight.

Clearly, there was no intention, and there never has been any intention, to tax beef bulls for dairy cattle improvement; but today, with beef cattle as a major industry right through the farm lands and high rainfall areas, the exemption laid down in section 3 of the Act is no longer valid, and except for the title of the Act there is nothing to prevent a demand that beef bulls be licensed in all these areas. Therefore, a very heavy impost could be placed on the beef industry without any reference to Parliament.

For this reason, Mr. President, I intend to give contingent notice of motion to extend the exemption under section 3 and thereby to exclude beef cattle, wherever they may be, from the operation of this Act. This will merely insert a provision giving the Minister power to proclaim beef bulls as being specifically exempted from this Act. This apparently cumbersome method must be used. It is most important that this Act be in no way invalidated through an amendment or its working impeded in any way. On the other hand, it

is impossible in any amendment to list beef breeds specifically by name.

We need only recall that just in the last few years Charolais cattle have come in as a very important breed for the future of South Australian beef cattle. They are being imported in the form of semen, as we cannot import the animals themselves. I do not think anyone 10 years ago had ever heard of the Murray Greys as an important beef breed, and the Santa Gertruda were unheard of at that time. Undoubtedly other breeds will have to be included as beef breeds from time to time. It is almost certain that we shall be having new breeds and new crosses. The beef breeding people are so busy today that there must be provision for new breeds to be proclaimed.

I think this exemption can be extended to beef breeds which are used for dairy stock. It is quite a common practice for dairymen to use beef breeds on heifers for the first breeding and particularly on marginal culls, where the progeny are not required for herd replacement. These progeny right from the first conception are destined for the beef industry. Bulls used in this way should not have to contribute to dairy cattle improvement.

I know that section 6 as amended, I think in 1940, excludes the licensing of bulls by people who are not engaged in dairying. However, I know of one instance not very far from my home of a landholder who runs a licensed dairy and is also a very large beef cattle stud breeder. Section 6 does not give him the exemption which is truly merited for his operations.

I do not think there is any need to go into detail on the working of the separate provisions of the Bill, for I think that has been ably covered by previous speakers. However, I certainly will support the Bill, and I commend the Minister for his restraint in not using it as an opportunity to increase the revenues of this State. I give notice of my intention to move the amendments I have foreshadowed.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 2.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, September 5, at 2.15 p.m.