

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 24, 1968

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

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HON. MR. HART'S APOLOGY

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. President, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On Thursday last the Hon. Mr. Hart made a personal explanation to this Council withdrawing a statement he had previously made and also apologizing to me for having made the statement. On that occasion I ungraciously interjected and said that I refused to accept the apology. As several matters have now been cleared up between us, I want to say that I believe the honourable member's apology was sincere and that I am now quite happy to accept it.

## QUESTIONS

## ISLINGTON CROSSING

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A few weeks ago I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport a question with regard to the Islington railway crossing. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study has recommended a road over-pass to eliminate the railway level crossing at Islington. In view of the close proximity to the Salisbury Freeway, it is proposed, subject to the Government's accepting the recommendations regarding the Salisbury Freeway, to construct the over-pass in conjunction with this section of the freeway in order to minimize inconvenience to the motoring public during construction operations.

The Highways Department has been aware for some time of the necessity to improve traffic conditions at the Islington railway crossing on Regency Road. Two basic proposals are at present being considered, one to widen the existing "at grade" crossing and the other to provide an over-pass. Both are costly projects.

The widening of the crossing would require extensive alterations to railway signalling, power, lighting, trackwork and buildings,

involving very costly alterations, which would still not provide an ideal solution as it would still remain a level crossing. The alternative solution of providing an over-pass is under active consideration.

## TUNA

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: According to a recent press statement, Japanese long-line tuna fishermen are responsible for some of the poor seasonal catches in the Port Lincoln area. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether that statement is correct?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I cannot say specifically whether the Japanese long-lining of tuna accounts for the reduced catch at Port Lincoln. However, it is well known that the Japanese have fished in Western Australian waters and in the waters off the New South Wales and the Tasmanian coasts for a number of years. What has brought about the present publicity is the fact that the Commonwealth Government has negotiated an agreement between the Japanese and the Australian Governments that the Japanese long-line fishermen will be phased out of the 12-mile limit for the territorial waters of Australia in a period of seven years. Access has been given to these fishermen to ports in Tasmania over a number of years and also to areas just north and south of Sydney. I do not think it can be said that Japanese fishermen have operated in South Australian waters within 12 miles of Port Lincoln at any stage.

The difference in the type of tuna is that where it is fished north of Sydney it would be the yellowfin tuna, but south of Sydney and around the Western Australian coast it would be the bluefin tuna. It is the bluefin tuna in which we in South Australia are particularly interested. Perhaps it would be wise if those people who were doing the criticizing at the moment took up the matter, through their organizations, with the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, who is responsible for fisheries, with a view to ascertaining the full facts of the agreement, which are not at present in my possession.

## SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I believe the Minister of Roads and Transport has a reply to my question of September 17 about the South-Eastern Freeway.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is expected that the Measdays-Stirling section of the South-Eastern Freeway will be completed during April, 1969. Through traffic will be using the

freeway proper before this time. However, the above date refers to overall completion including the Crafers interchange, all associated roadworks, and as much of the Stirling interchange as is required.

#### FARINA ROAD

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of September 17 about the maintenance of the Farina to Andamooka Road?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Highways Department maintains a section of track 18 miles in length from Farina westerly to Witchelina Homestead. Any tracks beyond Witchelina to Andamooka are not maintained by the department and, because of this, the tracks are not reliable, and the fact that there are no directional signposts erected would indicate that it would be unwise for any tourist to attempt to negotiate such a track in any vehicle other than a four-wheel drive in this territory.

The number of people who would wish to travel from Farina to Andamooka would not justify expenditure of funds to bring the track into a reliable condition. The resources of the department are fully committed in maintaining the present 6,500 miles of access roads (in the Far North) to station homesteads, mail routes, and more important roads. It is unwise for any tourist to attempt to travel on a track that is not defined as a passable route on a reliable road map and is not signed, in country such as that between Farina and Andamooka in the Far North.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Will the Minister take up with the South Australian Tourist Bureau the matter of the maps issued by that bureau so that they will clearly show that this is not a track that leads from Farina to Andamooka? There is nothing to give the common tourist any warning of the problems that he may have there.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall do that.

#### KULPARA SCHOOL

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: On August 13 I received a reply from the Minister representing the Minister of Education regarding the possibility of building a new school at Kulpara, part of which was as follows:

An approach has since been made to the South Australian Housing Trust for advice as

to whether it holds land at Kulpara on which a new residence could be built, and also concerning the estimated cost of such a residence. When this information is received, Cabinet approval will be sought for an order to be placed with the trust for a new residence.

He also stated:

There is already one timber classroom at the school and it is proposed to provide another and other necessary accommodation.

Can the Minister now say whether any reply has been received from the Housing Trust regarding whether it has land at Kulpara and the cost of erecting such a house, and whether any progress has been made as to the possibility of constructing additional school accommodation at Kulpara?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall ascertain that information for the honourable member.

#### SCIENTOLOGY

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Chief Secretary said recently that he would bring down a Bill to control scientology in this State, and I understood him to say that such a Bill would be introduced this week. In last night's *News* it was reported that the Secretary of the South Australian scientology movement had taken out a writ against Mr. Andrew Jones, M.H.R., for statements he had made against scientology. Can the Chief Secretary say whether, in the light of such a writ being issued, it means that the introduction of this Bill to curb the practice of scientology in South Australia will be held up?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No.

#### GILES POINT

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Marine.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I notice in the Loan Estimates that a sum of \$650,000 is provided for the erection of bulk loading facilities at Giles Point, the estimated total cost of which is \$2,264,000. Last year the expenditure on this project was \$423,000, which means that the total of this and last year's expenditure is \$1,073,000. As the total cost of the project is estimated to be \$2,264,000 it seems to indicate that the project is not as far advanced as I would have hoped it would be. Can the Minister therefore say what is the programme

for the completion of the bulk handling facilities at Giles Point?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The terminal storage facilities will be completed and grain will be received in the terminal when it is ready, and the shipping facilities will be completed in time to enable grain to be got away when the necessary sales have been made. However, I will obtain a detailed report from the Minister of Marine for the honourable member as to the amount expended and the sum still to be expended.

#### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 19. Page 1251.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): In supporting the Bill I wish to cover several subjects in detail. In connection with education, whilst I realize that this State's finances are strained to the limit in providing schools and teachers, I support a proposal that will add a little more to the load: that is, the proposal to establish a secondary school in the Tailem Bend district. This proposal was the subject of a deputation that recently waited on the Minister, but I stress that it is not only people in Tailem Bend itself who are involved.

There is intensive settlement near the Murray River, in the area south to Wellington and near the lake. Also, a substantial area of swamp land is being drained at Wellington, where more intensive settlement will occur. The more sparsely populated farming districts to the south and east of Tailem Bend must also be considered.

Except for the Tailem Bend people themselves, residents not on the Adelaide side of the river cannot obtain secondary education for their children unless they obtain board for them or, as frequently happens in the case of employees on dairy farms and on intensively farmed properties, unless the people move away from these areas to obtain education for their children.

The population of the areas I have referred to will build up and will justify a high school that can cope with about 300 students. I realize that the department's policy is to provide larger and larger high schools, but I question whether this policy is really sound. I recently perused a statement from an overseas educational authority that raises doubts about it. The overseas trend is to reverse this policy because it is believed that the educational

needs of children can be best served in smaller schools each of about 400 students.

In such schools it is possible for the experienced senior teachers to know their students as individuals, which knowledge is very important. At present, as the responsibilities of the Education Department rapidly expand, experienced teachers have to be spread more and more thinly over our secondary schools. Consequently, there is a very good case for looking closely at the department's present policy of establishing larger and larger schools. At Tailem Bend there is certainly a strong case for establishing a high school, which may be smaller than is usual but it would be in line with oversea thinking.

The Government is to be complimented on helping the fishing industry so quickly by the provision for expenditure on fishing havens in the South-East, thereby providing safer conditions. The fishing industry in the South-East is passing through what must be very hard times. Fishermen comprise one of the minority groups, the interests of which it is the clear duty of this Council to protect.

These men will have difficulties enough in the years ahead in correcting over-fishing of the crayfish grounds. Their hazardous occupation involves much capital expenditure, which is necessarily at risk every time they put to sea, so they thoroughly deserve what help can be given in improving port facilities and in providing safer conditions. The loss of an occasional fishing boat may not seem very much to city people but it means the loss of his life's savings to the fisherman concerned. It is only through better port services that these losses can be minimized.

It is pleasing to note that research laboratories are to be established at Kybybolite and Loxton. In this connection, I am sure we all carefully noted the comments in the Auditor-General's Report about the need for savings in the use of motor cars by public servants. I ask the Minister of Agriculture to examine closely any suggestions for blanket procedures to be followed throughout the Public Service and to avoid as far as possible restrictions on the use of cars by Agriculture Department officers, particularly where such restrictions would lead to more clerical work and form-filling.

I am very proud of the years I spent as an officer in this department, during which years this subject often came up. At the time I left the department, before any officer could use his car he had to obtain authorization, which had to be signed by a senior officer. At

the end of the week a report was made out and also a claim form for living and travelling expenses.

Many hours were spent during a year in completely unproductive work of this nature and more hours were spent by senior officers in signing these endless forms and reports as well as in preparing their own reports. This, in turn, meant more and more work for the clerical staff in cross-checking all these forms, putting them in order and then making out accounts.

The most important cog in the set-up of this State's Agriculture Department is the officer who is in contact with the farmers and who is servicing the industry, and his most important tool is his vehicle. The hours spent in the field are the productive hours, and any work that keeps him at his desk and which is not directly concerned with farmers must be regarded as parasitic and as work that diverts from its true function the money provided to run the department. I ask the Minister, in seeking to economize, not to load more forms on the technical men in the department or elsewhere in the Public Service, but if possible to free them from these onerous tasks which have nothing to do with their real function.

Last year we saw some horrible things arise in seeking to economize. Only one visit was permitted the officers of the Agriculture Department for crop inspection for certification of seed, and in effect it meant that no crop could be certified. This would have cost the State millions of dollars. I am glad that the position was corrected in time.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They are putting up the fees.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am sorry to hear that. No doubt this industry will have to carry the racket. On another occasion a farmer with a difficult technical problem sought the advice of his district officer, who was told he could not visit the area because of the mileage involved. I believe that the few cases of improper use of motor vehicles which occur (I know from my many years of experience that they are few) would be best met by disciplinary action rather than by loading the technical staff with unnecessary paper work.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Doesn't the restriction apply to the use of cars on a private basis?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think it applies to both classes of use. In my personal experience, I think it is just as necessary that there be discipline both in the case of where the cars are Government owned and where hire

charges are being paid. The reason for that is unnecessary to detail, but there is a variable mileage rate which is designed to cover the insurance and interest charges. From my personal knowledge I can say that in the great majority of cases these men are dedicated to their work and work without thought for themselves. They often spend a great deal of their own time without extra reward. In one particular instance that came into my ken a memorandum came back endorsing an officer's report with the remark, "I don't see how this man could have driven the distance that is recorded and carried out any effective work." In other words, there is constant supervision of the claims. When inquiry was made it was found that this man had done most of his travelling at night in his own time. He was actually spending up to 38 per cent overtime in the field without any thought of any reward.

In my day (I am sure it still obtains today) most of these men had no entitlement to any overtime or similar award, and they spent many nights every year at meetings and other engagements as part of their normal work. I think I have said enough on that subject. I am sure the Minister has registered what I mean.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Does he agree with you?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In the industry in which I am at present engaged (apple and pear growing) we face in the year ahead probably the heaviest crop that South Australia has ever had in prospect. We also face considerable difficulties in shrinking overseas markets for our produce and rapidly spiralling costs, particularly in export freight but also in every item used or consumed by the apple grower. This, of course, is a very common tale in practically all sides of agriculture, but in no industry are the problems so acute as in the fruitgrowing industry, as members would be well aware.

In this industry we are dependent on the loans to co-operatives under the Loans to Producers Act. I am very glad indeed to note that this item is carried forward again this year. I am happy to be able to report to the Council that the apple and pear industry is making a united and concerted attack on the problem of the coming harvest which has at present every prospect of success in solving our immediate difficulties, although not all our difficulties, for it will be four or five years before we can see our way clear in this matter.

I must bring the Minister of Agriculture into the subject again and on behalf of the industry thank him sincerely for the efforts he has already made. These efforts may well be the keystone of any success achieved. It is very deeply appreciated also that his officers are backing the efforts being made.

Before leaving agricultural subjects I must refer to the dairying industry. Mainly through the overloading of world markets by heavily-subsidized production from other countries, the position overall is not at all a happy one, particularly for the smaller dairy farmer with less than 50 cows. Each year he is being asked to accept a lower and lower standard of living. The position is probably not as acute in South Australia as it is in other States, I think because without any question the dairying industry is more efficient here than anywhere else in Australia. In fact, I think it probably compares favourably with anywhere else in the world.

Thanks primarily to the very high quality and cleanliness of the milk produced, the great part of our surplus production in South Australia goes to the manufacture of cheese, which is of a standard equal to the best in the world. With it we are competing successfully in the very discriminating market of Japan and meeting head-on competition with the highest quality produce from Holland and other parts of Europe. It is an anomaly, perhaps, that South Australia is no longer self-supporting in butter. We must now import what I think is by far the greater part of our needs from other States.

The credit for the high standard of our industry has to go to the dairying branch of the Agriculture Department, not only for its herd recording, artificial insemination, bull subsidy system and the extension aids to the farmers (these have lifted production per cow each year) but also for the far lesser known aid and guidance which has been given to the manufacturing side of the industry, which has improved so tremendously the quality of the products of the dairying industry. Nevertheless, I do not believe that sufficient recognition has been given to the very hard pressure today upon the smaller dairyman, who is the backbone of the industry, particularly in the Adelaide Hills, where small acreages and very high land values place a strict limit upon the number of cows that can be carried in a herd.

The man with larger acreage to command is at present meeting the problem by increasing cow numbers and herd size. However, these measures bring the bedeviling of an increasing surplus of milk to be disposed of and

inevitably, when it goes into export, lowered returns. At present heavy pressure is being put on dairymen to introduce refrigerated storage on farms, and in fact in some areas such installations are enforced. This pressure is, of course, coming from the Milk Board, which has the responsibility of ensuring a pure milk supply to the non-dairying public. I think it should be looked at again. It places a heavy capital expenditure upon men who can ill afford it. In fact, in the great majority of cases, to meet the cost, finance must be sought, which, as with all hire-purchase, is at high interest rates.

At present, the onus is on the dairy farmer who sends his milk to Adelaide to deliver clean milk to his milk factory. If he does not do so, his milk is condemned. If the offence is repeated, his licence to supply city milk is withdrawn. In fact, I believe there are good technical grounds to consider that, if farm refrigeration of milk becomes general, further costs will be loaded on to the industry. Under the present system with no refrigeration but water-cooling, any fault in hygiene or disease shows up immediately, and the fault can be traced back at once to the farm, and even, if necessary, to the individual animal concerned.

Cooling milk immediately by refrigeration prevents deterioration and hides such defects. Whereas the simple, cheap and very effective methylene blue test is now effective in detecting trouble in the very early stages, with refrigeration there is a much greater risk that milk with a gross defect will reach the cheese vats and show its defect when it is incubated for the lactic acid fermentation, which is the first step in the manufacture of cheese. Faults showing at this stage are a very serious matter indeed, for not one farmer's milk but a whole batch of cheese (nearly 1,000 gallons of milk) is involved, and to prevent these accidents it is very likely that with refrigerated milk in general a much more costly and time-consuming bacteriological examination will be needed to detect these milk faults. The costs will, of course, be considerable and must be deducted from the farmers' returns. Nobody else pays the bills in the dairying industry.

I support the plea made by previous speakers for the need for better side illumination on goods trains. This is a problem in the northern districts about which we have heard much, but it is more of a problem in the Southern District, where on the line between Adelaide and Melbourne very long trains of 50 vehicles

are the rule. It is difficult to see them and in much of our country, when we approach a crossing, both the locomotives and the guard's van are often out of view, as are the goods trucks. This always occurs when the train is half a mile long. Often, both the locomotives and the guard's van are out of sight at the crossing itself, and the unilluminated trucks are passing over the crossing for a considerable time. The position is very dangerous at the Woodside road crossing at Nairne, where not infrequently trains have to be held stationary across the crossing while oncoming traffic is worked through. This crossing is peculiarly dangerous on a wet night when visibility is poor. Approaching from the north a dip holds the beam from properly adjusted headlights off the crossing until the last few yards of approach, and the glare of the lights along the highway 100 or 200 yards farther along does not help. Although, since a fatal accident happened, an overhead light has been installed to illuminate the trucks that may be standing there, there have still been some narrow escapes, and I bring it to the notice of the Minister of Roads and Transport that further improvement should be made.

My last remarks refer to the Hills freeway. Although there have not been many protests, many of us are deeply concerned at the devastation wrought in some of the most beautiful country of the Adelaide Hills. Although a start has been made to repair this damage, it is more than apparent that the original beauty can never be restored. I suppose we must face many unpleasant things in the name of progress, but I am deeply disturbed at the announcement this week that yet another traffic interchange is planned for the Bridgewater district. It will, I suppose, take just as large an area of some of our most beautiful country as those already under construction at Crafers and Stirling. On behalf of Hills residents, I beg the Minister to look at the need for this traffic interchange before it is too late. The present road system is more than sufficient to carry all the local traffic of the Adelaide Hills. I assume there will be a traffic interchange at Verdun. Surely it is not asking too much of Bridgewater residents that they travel the short distance to Stirling through the light traffic that will be carried on these roads when the through traffic is taken by the freeway. Surely it is desirable to have as few traffic interchanges as possible along the freeway—and four of them within five miles or less is going a little too far.

In the more distant planning of the freeway, too, a fault is being made. We have been told that the plan is to take the route from near Nairne and rejoin the present main road at the right-angle corner at Callington, then by-passing Murray Bridge and crossing the river some miles south of the present bridges. I believe a much better route can be found for this road by leaving the present planned route shortly after it passes Hahndorf and taking it south of the Mount Barker township roughly along the line of the present road to Wistow; then following the direct present road to Hartley and continuing in a direct line to a crossing at Wellington, where a very much cheaper bridge can be constructed, thanks to the lower bank heights involved; and from that point taking a direct line through Cookes Plains, joining the present highway at Coomandook. This route will save many miles and many millions of dollars, because it crosses much easier terrain than the present proposed route. But a fraction of the earth-work will be involved, and much more rapid construction will be possible. I understand that this route has been promoted from outside Parliament. I know this country well. It is certainly worthy of serious consideration by the Highways Department. I support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I think the Treasurer in presenting his statement on the Loan Estimates acted wisely in explaining to members the manner in which the Loan Council controls the availability of Loan funds. Although I am sure that most honourable members knew what the set-up was regarding the allocation of funds, it did not stop certain members of the Cabinet from making all kinds of absurd statements about the previous Government's not being able to make money available for projects. Indeed, the kind of statement made by members of the Liberal and Country League during the last three years, and particularly just before the last State election (at which the present Government secured 43 per cent of the votes, compared with 52 per cent received by the present Opposition), highlights their hypocrisy because they have, during this debate, supported the Bill without criticism.

Under the Commonwealth formula for the allocation of funds to the States through the Loan Council, members could have worked out to the last cent the sum that would have been made available to this State. Despite all the information available to members opposite,

they still continue to make promises that they know they have no chance of implementing. Let us examine a few of the promises they have made, and the results. Part of a political commentary in the *Advertiser* on February 24, 1968, states:

Mr. Steele Hall and the L.C.L.'s strong team of candidates are anxious to press on with work essential to the welfare of all South Australians and the development of the State. At the top of the list of priorities is determination to get on with the building of the Chowilla dam.

This will provide the water we must have if our economy is to expand. Other urgent tasks to be undertaken by an L.C.L. Government include the building of an adequate hospital at Modbury, a teaching hospital near Flinders University . . .

So it goes on. One can see that in February the top priority on the list was the Chowilla dam. However, it does not even get a mention now. It is just as well that it was not down the list a little.

I appreciate the necessity for an ample water supply for this State, but before we commit ourselves to the extent to which Government members have committed themselves in relation to the Chowilla dam, all the facts and figures should be fully studied. Because sufficient study was not given to Chowilla, as a result of more detailed design studies the estimated cost rose from the 1961 figure of \$28,000,000 to \$43,000,000 in 1966 and, when tenders closed in April, 1967, the most favourable tender resulted in a further increase to \$68,000,000. That did not daunt members opposite from promising the building of the dam regardless of cost, yet no mention is made of it in this year's Loan Estimates. That is how concerned L.C.L. members are about their No. 1 priority.

In its policy speech before the election, the L.C.L. knew that, as a result of plans being drawn up and of a submission being made by the Labor Government to the Public Works Standing Committee, three members of which are now Ministers of the present Government, the committee unanimously recommended that a new hospital be constructed at Modbury, yet the L.C.L. now speaks only of an adequate hospital at Modbury. When that statement was made, preparatory groundwork was already in progress. Members opposite also criticized the use of Highways Department machinery for carrying out groundwork for the Modbury Hospital. Indeed, a great to do was made about that, yet this machinery is still on the site. One can see, therefore, that members opposite were prepared to say anything that

came into their heads but they were not prepared to alter anything when their Party went into office.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: That was not an "instant" hospital, I gather.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This hospital was far more instant than was a hospital proposed by the L.C.L. Government, which took 10 years to prepare for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. When the Labor Party came into office, no preparatory work had been done by the L.C.L. to provide a hospital at Modbury except to obtain a block of land, which was unsuitable for the purpose anyway. However, within three years under a Labor Government work had commenced on the Modbury Hospital, which is so necessary and desirable for the people in that district.

It can be seen, therefore, that concerning this hospital the Labor Government was seven years ahead of the planning by the L.C.L. Government for the erection of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, so surely the Modbury Hospital was instant planning compared with that of the Liberal Government in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Seven years to plan Queen Elizabeth but seven days to plan Modbury!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Never mind about that. It took the Government 10 years to get off the ground in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: That is not quite true.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, it is exactly true, and that is what we want. The sum of \$150,000 has been allocated towards the cost of this hospital. Obviously, the Government is not enthusiastic about the project, despite the fact that the Public Works Committee, of which three present Cabinet Ministers (including the Minister of Works) were members, made a unanimous recommendation on it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you suggesting that the present Government changed the planning of the hospital?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I suggest that the present Government is not proceeding up to time with the present hospital by allocating only \$150,000 for this necessary and desirable project. I am not suggesting that the planning was changed. I have no doubt that when the Government used the words "adequate hospital at Modbury" it had in mind a 100-bed community hospital.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It prepared for only a 60-bed hospital.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It should have known that a growing district like Modbury, which is so well represented by the members for the Midland District, would go ahead. As well as that, the Labor member for Barossa in another place represents this area, so it must go ahead.

The commentary also says that another urgent task to be undertaken by the L.C.L. Government, if elected, was the erection of a teaching hospital near the Flinders University. The decision of the Public Works Committee also brought to notice the desirability of a hospital near the Flinders University, but members opposite knew that such a hospital could not be used as a teaching hospital unless a medical school was established at the university. Despite that, the L.C.L. Government says that it will establish a teaching hospital near the Flinders University, but there is not one word about attempting to provide a teaching or medical school at the university. The Government would go ahead and build that hospital without having the necessary students available to be trained in it. That is the sort of planning that the L.C.L. Government undertakes. Despite all this, the Party opposite said this was another of its very urgent tasks, and although I do not think it was a good idea to suggest that a teaching hospital be erected there before a medical school was provided, again one finds nothing provided for what was said to be one of the top priorities.

The Government had no intention of going ahead with this scheme. No allocation has been made in the Government's legislation for either its No. 1 or No. 2 priority, and it does not appear at this stage that Flinders will have a medical school during the next triennium, which covers the years from 1970 to 1972. In those circumstances, a teaching hospital will not be of any use in the district until 1976, yet this was to be a top priority. The L.C.L. members either knew nothing about it or they deliberately attempted to mislead the people at the election.

The Premier also promised a shot in the arm for the building industry, which he described as being neglected and run down as a result of the Labor Government's administration. However, when the time came to administer the shot in the arm, the Government could not go ahead with the plan. All it did was to tie one arm behind its back. It allocated \$1,500,000 less than the amount provided last year under the Commonwealth-

State Housing Agreement. Also, the present Government has lifted price control on bricks and on some builder's hardware, with the result that the prices of houses will increase. There will be less money for building houses, and fewer borrowers will be able to obtain a cut out of the depleted funds that are to be made available by the Government.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said he doubted whether the waiting time would be increased. I point out, however, that it is obvious to everyone except the honourable member that, before the increase, for every \$56,000 available eight people could borrow the full amount and build a house. After the increase, however, for every \$56,000 available only seven people could borrow the full amount. So, obviously the same number of houses cannot be built and less money will be available. I agree that it is necessary for the size of individual loans to be increased because of the ever-increasing cost of housing and living, but to say that the waiting list will not be increased is eye-wash. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said the last increase in the amount of the loan was made 10 years ago and that he regretted that the Labor Government had not altered that amount during the last three years. I point out, however, that nothing was done by the Liberal and Country League Government during the previous seven years. So, the honourable member at least gave the Labor Government credit for moving twice as fast as did the L.C.L. Government.

In the light of all these points it is no wonder that the Premier yesterday threw up his hands in despair and said, "People of South Australia, give me ideas: I have none left." This is the sort of appeal that the Premier is putting up to the people today, yet during the election campaign he said he had a ton of ideas. The Premier has no ideas to get the State moving, so he appeals to all and sundry to help him. The best suggestion that could be made to the L.C.L. Government is to keep away from the Treasury benches—a suggestion the people made by giving the L.C.L. only 43 per cent of the votes at the last election. The Premier, however, is not prepared to accept this suggestion. Let us consider today's reaction to the Premier's plea for ideas. In today's *News* Councillor W. Hayes is reported as saying:

If any State in Australia needs new ideas, this one does.

He could not be more correct. The editorial in today's *News* states:



The pooling of ideas is good in any business, including Government, but in the end it is going to be dynamic leadership, imaginative planning, and sheer hard work which will give the needed boost to this State.

And I say that the present Government does not have one of those qualities, and this is why it is appealing to the people for ideas to get this State moving. I agree that the Government has got things moving, but it has got them moving backwards.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: You accept what the *News* says, do you?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I simply quoted two statements from it. The first statement was that of Councillor Hayes, not that of the *News*. I was interested in the provision for fishing havens and foreshore improvements. The sum of \$117,000 is provided to complete the new jetty at Glenelg. L.C.L. Governments in the past have not been very helpful in regard to this jetty, so no doubt the present Government is not very happy that, as a result of the interest shown by the Labor Government in tourism and in foreshore improvements, it now has to toe the line and provide \$117,000 for this purpose. Let us consider what has happened since 1948, when a storm destroyed the previous Glenelg jetty and the council was anxious to rebuild it. How active was the L.C.L. Government in this connection? Since April 11, 1948, when the jetty was destroyed, three deputations have waited on the Premier of the day, two on an L.C.L. Premier and one on a Labor Party Premier. The first deputation met the then Premier soon after the jetty was destroyed, but it was knocked back by the Playford Government, which had no interest in reconstructing the jetty or in tourism. Another deputation waited on the then Premier in 1950, but the result was exactly the same.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We were spending all the money on improvements to the Patawalonga.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You were not interested in tourism, in respect of the jetty. The L.C.L. Government was not interested in the Glenelg ratepayers and in the citizens of this State who wanted to use a jetty at Glenelg. After the Labor Government came to power a third deputation waited on the then Premier on March 10, 1967, when the Glenelg council received a most favourable hearing, because of the Government's interest in tourism and in beautifying the coast line. Glenelg could be made a most attractive tourist resort but the Liberal Government

took no interest in it at all. Following the deputation on March 10, 1967, plans and specifications were drawn up and on January 4, 1968, the Glenelg council received approval to go ahead with the job. It had to find one-third of the cost and the Government agreed to find two-thirds of the cost, provided the total cost did not exceed \$128,500. The first test pile was driven on March 9, so within a year from the deputation's waiting on the Labor Premier the first test pile was driven, yet during the previous nine years the Glenelg council was unable to persuade the L.C.L. Government to get things moving.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You thought it was more important than the fishing industry.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We believe in tourism, and we also believe that the ratepayers should have something for their money.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The fishermen don't matter!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Let us see what members of the present Government did regarding that industry. A select Committee was set up by the Labor Government to inquire into the needs of that industry. Everyone knew that under the previous Liberal Government the industry was in a pretty bad way and needed investigating. Immediately following the first meeting of that committee, three of the Liberal members resigned; they were not prepared even to look into the conditions of the fishing industry. Yet the Hon. Sir Norman Jude just said that we were not concerned about that industry. It was the Labor Government that set up a committee to look into the needs of the fishing industry. Members opposite would not participate in that inquiry because they were not prepared to face up to what had to be done, and not prepared to accept responsibility for the condition that they had allowed the industry to get into while they were in office.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They were more interested in playing politics.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They were no more interested in a new jetty at Glenelg than they were in the fishing industry. The Hon. Mr. Geddes expressed the wish that money be made available to improve conditions for fishermen in the Northern District, and to some extent he criticized the Government for concentrating on the ports in the South-East. The Government concentrated on the South-East ports because of the

Millicent by-election, during which we saw Harbors Board employees going along with a load of logs and other things and dumping them at Robe when a public meeting was to be addressed by the present Premier. The next day these same logs would be picked up and put down at South End because another public meeting was to be held there. The Liberal Party told all the people that, if they returned to Parliament a person by the name of Cameron, progress would be made in the South-East. This was the only reason there was any interest in the fishing industry, and that is why \$93,000 is being made available today for the ports in the South-East.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: They kept their promise.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course they did: they could not do anything else. They also kept many things back, and this is why an extra \$1,000 is being spent this year compared with last year. The Liberal Party members thought they would "con" the fishermen into voting for them. Yet we find that on March 2 the fishermen and other people were equally divided as to which Party they would vote for, and within less than six months there was a 7 per cent difference in the votes for Labor compared to the L.C.L. votes.

I suggest to the Hon. Mr. Geddes that if he wants to gain in the Northern District he create a position whereby a similar by-election can be held there; he may then get something done for Port Lincoln and other places in the district. On reflection, I think perhaps it would be better if the by-election were for another place. We are most fortunate people up here, for we are elected by about 25 per cent or 26 per cent of the adult people. We must not get away from that, for it might upset the equilibrium, and we on this side might even get more than four members.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You thought you were going to win Northern last March.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, we did not. I know that the Minister thought he was going to lose Central No. 2, and he was very worried about the position; no-one was more surprised than he when he was returned to this Council. We did exceptionally well in Central No. 1. Had it not been for your integrity, Mr. President, I have no doubt that we would have won Northern. That was the only district in which the Liberal Party gained: in every other district it lost a con-

siderable number of votes from those people eligible to vote for the Legislative Council.

I have attempted to show the insincerity of Government members who when in Opposition accused the then Labor Government of all kinds of things. Liberal members suggested that because we did what Liberal Governments in Australia had done for years we were doing something improper. They said that what we were doing by using some of the Loan funds for capital works which had not been previously charged to Loan Account was improper use of Loan funds. However, we find today that the present Government is not only continuing to do what it said was improper but is allocating a greater amount of Loan funds for capital works.

A recent report in the newspaper said that the Chief Secretary no longer practised hypnotism. I suggest that he will have to continue with his hypnotism to get his Party back into office at the next election. He gave away the practice too soon, and I think he had better get into training again as soon as possible. Apparently he was able to hypnotize many people at the last election, and now that he has given it away the Government will not have a hope when it goes to the people again. The present Government did not even get a mandate last time. Nevertheless, the Chief Secretary hypnotized sufficient people to enable his Government constitutionally (that is the only word one can use) to sit on the Treasury benches today.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That is not a bad reason to be here.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Not a bad reason at all. The Minister in his own district represents less than 25 per cent of the adult people in the area. The Government in the other place represents only 43 per cent of all the people. Surely the things this Government is now doing are exactly what it said the Labor Government was doing improperly.

I am disappointed at the omission of allocations for two very important projects which I think would be most desirable. One glaring omission is a school for the training of memory, which is known as Pelmanism. The necessity for such a provision has been highlighted by the many things Government members have now completely forgotten, although they were very vocal about them when they were in Opposition. The necessity for such a training school has been further highlighted by the glaring instance of the Hon. Mr. Hart attempting to take a point of order when I

was saying that he was not prepared to attend a public meeting in his own district when the district was up in arms over the announcement by the Minister of Roads and Transport that he was going to curtail the rail service to the Wallaroo District. The honourable member, in speaking to his point of order, said that the meeting was not a public meeting; yet we find at page 130 of *Hansard* the honourable member saying:

I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave was granted, and the honourable member continued:

On Tuesday, May 14, a public meeting was held in the Wallaroo Town Hall to protest against the possible curtailment of the Moonta to Adelaide passenger train services.

We then find at page 363 of *Hansard* myself saying:

It was interesting to hear the Hon. Mr. Hart apologizing for the fact that he took an interest in the South-East drainage position . . . This follows what happened a few days earlier when he rose on a vital matter concerning his own electoral district (the reducing of railway services) where a public meeting was called and he was very "snitchy" about the fact that he did not receive an invitation to that meeting.

A little later the Hon. Mr. Hart rose and said:

On a point of order, Mr. President, I should like to draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that it was not a public meeting at Wallaroo.

Why the difference between page 130 and page 363, if the honourable member has not lost his memory? I am being generous to him when I say that perhaps it was a loss of memory; on the other hand, it may be misrepresentation, as we have so clearly discovered has been the case on other occasions. Why the difference between the Government's policy speech and what the Government is doing today? The same honourable member referred to the fact that the Electoral Bill in another place was not being processed. He implied that it was the fault of the Australian Labor Party. Surely he has forgotten the fact that the Liberal and Country League members are in charge of the Notice Paper in another place, and it was not the fault of the A.L.P. that this Bill was not being processed. I think that such a training school as I have mentioned is necessary, and I recommend, when it is established, that many of these L.C.L. members with short memories attend it.

Another glaring omission is that there is no provision in these Loan Estimates for a new

Western Teachers College. The conditions obtaining at the present Western Teachers College are deplorable. I have with me a newsletter from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which lists some of the disabilities as follows:

**Working Conditions:** Both at Currie Street and at Taylors Road the working conditions must actually be seen and experienced before any idea of their inconvenience can be understood. At Currie Street work goes on in a mid-Victorian school building overlooking a small asphalt exercise yard, bounded by some of the State's noisiest roads, and filled with the clamour and smells of industrial plants.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: And the smell of the brewery, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes; it is a West End brewery, which would have a much worse smell than some other breweries. However, let us look at what the honourable member said last year about what was left out of the Estimates, in view of his now accusing us of overspending, not raising sufficient taxation, etc., and saying that we could not do it all in three years when this sort of thing had been going on for years and years under a Liberal Government. Yet the Liberal Party expected us in one term of office to rectify the mistakes the Liberal Government had been making for the last 30 years. When we were in Government, we were well on the way to doing these things, to raising more money to give us a new Western Teachers College, the old one having been allowed to go to rack and ruin. This is the job of the Government. Is it any wonder that the Premier today is asking the public for ideas as his Government has no ideas of its own? The article I was reading continues:

Lecturers struggle to make themselves heard above all this din in crowded classrooms, tin sheds or old cloakrooms, or even in the canteen.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude makes an interjection that I do not quite catch. I am glad to have his attention and hope he will answer for the Government's not putting into operation what it promised it would do in this regard. The honourable member can do that instead of fiddling with his earphone or turning it up and wondering whether or not he is going to hear me. The article continues:

Fundamental needs are for strong voices in lecturers and remarkable powers of intense concentration in students. Over all hangs the consciousness that in a few minutes the rush back to Taylors Road or elsewhere must start. Over the page in this S.A.I.T. newsletter we read:

**Lecture Rooms:** Reference has already been made to the general chaotic inadequacy of

buildings. Particular difficulties are those of overcrowding where groups struggle to find places in rooms not half big enough; fortunate earlycomers get seats; others stand around the aisles or listen at doors.

Science Laboratories: Eight science subjects are taught with one small laboratory. The utter impossibility of conducting all work here means that students travel back and forth daily.

As regards the travelling allowance, which is being taken away by the present Government, is it any wonder there was a shortage of teachers under the last L.C.L. Government? Is it any wonder there will again be a shortage of teachers under the new L.C.L. Government? When we came into office, the previous L.C.L. Government had not given trainee teachers any increase in allowances for 10 years. We rectified that to the best of our ability and gave them an increase, only to find that within six months of the new Government's assuming office it has increased their allowances to the extent of \$85 but has also taken back from the students \$120; and it has the audacity to say that that represents an increased allowance for student teachers.

This sort of set-up continues in regard to the overcrowding at the Western Teachers College. It is most disappointing to know that nothing has been done there by this Government. It was because of the Liberal Government that this college got into its present deplorable state: therefore, it should be through this Government in its present term of office that the college should be got out of the mess it is in, but not a move has been made in that direction. I join with the Minister of Education when she criticizes the previous L.C.L. Government. In doing so, she is only joining the ranks of many thousands of South Australians who have criticized the L.C.L. Government. She is many years late with her criticisms, but at least she is catching up and I venture to suggest she will apply to come over to our side because I think she is at last seeing the light in that she is taking it on herself to criticize the previous L.C.L. Government. We have been doing that for years and are continuing to do so. We are gradually increasing the size of our fold—to wit, by the inclusion of the Minister of Education, who now criticizes the Liberal Party.

I refer now to a letter from Mr. W. A. White, President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. It deals with the appalling makeshift conditions at the Western Teachers College, which call for immediate action. It states:

As the article indicates, the work of the staff and the students is carried on in a most unattractive setting and the education and training being provided is made less effective and extremely more difficult. These very unsatisfactory conditions have developed because in the past the funds available have been insufficient to enable the building of a modern Western Teachers College and, at the same time, to meet the demands for the new schools required to accommodate the rapidly increasing school population.

We can appreciate the financial difficulties, because we were told all about them in the latest reports given about the present Budget, but over the last three years we were informed that there should not be any financial difficulty: "you should not have to worry about blaming the Commonwealth Government for not making funds available for these things." We were told, "That is your responsibility", yet when one reads the Treasurer's statement on the Budget that was presented in another place one finds no fewer places than six where the South Australian Government is accusing the Commonwealth Government of not coming to the party. Why has there been such a change in the last six months? If we were supposed to stand on our own feet, why could the present Government not stand on its own feet? This shows just how hypocritical are some members opposite. The letter goes on to say (and this is very good of the institute):

We are not wishing to be critical of any Government nor of any officers of the Education Department, but we are very anxious that the people of South Australia, as well as all of our representatives in Parliament, are made aware of the situation.

It is because of their desire to have all members of Parliament made aware of the situation that I have read out some of the difficulties which exist at the teachers college now and which have existed for well over 20 years. It is a most deplorable thing that this Government should not make one cent available to improve the conditions under which our future teachers are working today.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It was put there only as a temporary measure.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, the same as the gerrymander was put there only as a temporary measure, irrespective of what merit it has. But there is no merit in it at all. It is with regret and disappointment that I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 1201.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Health): I thank members for the attention they have given this small measure which, although it is not a big Bill, deals particularly with three matters. It deals first with the question of vermin infestation, particularly in relation to the infestation of children. Secondly, it deals with fees and the licensing of private hospitals, and provides that such fees are to be imposed by regulation. Thirdly, it deals with the redefinition of institutions dealing with tuberculosis. During the course of the debate many matters were raised. Indeed, the Leader raised several points, and at this stage I commend him on the amount of research he undertook into the question of what is an inspector under this Act.

When referring to the question of penalty, the Leader said:

Although the penalty has been increased to \$40, which seems to be a large sum, it is not imposed unless parents neglect to look after the cleanliness and health of their children.

I point out that clause 7 of the Bill, as well as section 134 of the principal Act, deals with an infected person mixing with the public without taking reasonable precautions against the spread of the disease. A penalty of \$40 is provided.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I was trying to say that it seemed to be high.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. However, there is no increase in the penalty. The clause is only including in that section the question of infestation as well as of infection. The Leader undertook much research on the question of what is a health inspector and dealt, first, with the desirability or otherwise of including in the principal Act a definition of "inspector". While I agree that it is modern drafting practice to include such definitions, this Act was drafted at about the turn of the century and did not then include such definitions. The Health Act was last re-enacted in 1935, which was really only a consolidation of the original Act. I assure the Leader that the references throughout the Act are to inspectors appointed by local boards under powers given by section 47 of the principal Act. This clause deals with the matter of health inspectors. The Leader suggested that it might be possible for other inspectors to exercise powers under this Act. However, I feel that

this is not possible because the inspectors referred to draw their powers from section 47 and, pursuant to section 49 of the Act, an inspector is required to carry a duplicate copy of his appointment as an inspector under the Act. I think, therefore, that the matter is covered sufficiently at this stage and I can see no advantage to be served by including such a definition in the Act (although I agree that it is modern drafting practice so to do).

The Leader raised the question of inspectors appointed pursuant to the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act, but I point out that the powers of inspection given under that Act are only vested in food and drug inspectors insofar as they relate to matters referred to in section 43(1). Such matters relate not to matters of public health generally but to food and drug administration. In other words, where powers are vested in the food and drug inspector, only the specific matters referred to in section 43(1) apply to such inspectors. I can see nothing unusual or improper in vesting these powers in such inspectors.

The qualifications desired of an inspector indicate that, within the limits of finance available to local authorities, only the best qualified inspectors are obtained. Indeed, I understand that at present all inspectors in the metropolitan area have appropriate qualifications.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What title do they use? Do they use the title of "medical officer" or "inspector"? That is the kernel of the thing.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will come to that. At present all inspectors in the metropolitan area have appropriate qualifications.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not doubt that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Indeed, a large proportion of inspectors in country areas have similar qualifications but, because of the limited revenue-raising capacity of some councils, exemptions have been given to them. This is contained in the regulations, which are subject to the scrutiny of this Council. Every member will appreciate that in many areas it is not possible to attract a person with the necessary qualifications to the position of health inspector. For example, let us consider outback areas, which present a problem in respect of vermin control. These areas are infrequently visited by medical officers. The amendment gives power to the local health inspector, who in many cases is the local policeman. He is appointed by the Central Board of Health to certify that disinfection and disinfestation should be carried out. The legislation provides the safeguard that the necessary work is to be

carried out subject to the directions of the Central Board of Health or local board in a case where the inspector is not qualified.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: And it is only on the advice of the medical officer.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. It is impossible to appoint people with health inspection qualifications in all areas of the State, but all inspectors in the metropolitan area have these qualifications. In some areas lack of revenue and inability to pay full fees are factors that must be considered. I turn now to the question that an inspector with a council may use the description "local government health officer".

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: He should not use it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I refer to Part V of the principal Act, "Officers". Section 47 provides:

Every local board shall appoint an officer of health, and such inspectors and officers as may be deemed necessary by the Central Board.

Even an inspector is still an officer of the board, according to the heading of the principal Act. In conclusion, I turn to the question of the right of inspectors to enter premises. I stress that this Bill does not increase these powers in any way.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In my speech on the second reading I said "on first impression".

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realize that. The legislation merely gives the officer the right to report to the local board on any premises. It gives very limited powers of entry to an inspector. These powers have been provided for in the Act since about 1870, and I am not aware of any complaint about their abuse. The inspector is simply allowed to report to the board on the question of an infestation: this is as far as the increase in powers goes. I thank honourable members for the attention they have given to the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Can the Minister of Health explain the meaning of the Latin terms in this clause?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Health): It would be a pleasure for me to do so but I point out to the honourable member that the Hon. Mr. Springett adequately explained them in his second reading speech.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Disinfection of buildings and articles."

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I take strong exception to people in local government taking upon themselves a title that they have no right to use. The term "medical officer" means "medical practitioner", yet these people, who are inspectors, use the term "health officer". They are not health officers: they are health inspectors, and it is time we made this quite clear, because their duties are clearly set out. I cannot remember the Health Act being amended during the Labor Government's term of office.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It was amended last year.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Because of this Act's importance I suggest that it should be consolidated. I realize that this would involve much hard work. When I was Minister of Health I had grave doubts about many matters connected with health, and I have my own personal views about what should be done. Within the metropolitan area different interpretations are placed upon some things. We should have a really good look at this Act. I appreciate what the Minister of Health has done, and I think he appreciates what I did when I occupied that office. I think deep down the Minister agrees with what I am saying.

I do not intend to press the matter further. However, I will take particular note of certain things and if I find that people are assuming a status to which they are not entitled I will do everything I can to see that action is taken.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 17) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 1202.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Roads and Transport): I thank honourable members for their consideration of this measure, and particularly I thank the Hon. Mr. Kneebone who, judging by his speech, undertook much research. He went to great lengths to express his concern that the procedure adopted in this Bill to alter the Northfield terminus could be a precedent to closing railway lines under the guise of altering a railway terminus. Let me give him a complete assurance here and now that the Government has no such intention.

This Bill seeks legally to alter the terminus for this line by a distance of 17 chains, and I am sure all members agree that this is a logical action.

The Transport Control Board is at present conducting investigations under the provisions of the Road and Railway Transport Act in respect of the closing of the Eudunda-Morgan line and the Hallett Cove to Willunga line, and it will conduct similar inquiries in respect of any other railway lines proposed to be closed. In respect of these, the consequent procedures for a reference to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works will follow.

This procedure is similar to that adopted when the rail terminus at Kingston in the South-East was altered a short distance, and I can assure members that it will only be used for this purpose and the occasions on which it is required are extremely rare.

The procedures being adopted in connection with the programme announced some time ago to rationalize the South Australian Railways services is quite consistent with the Road and Railway Transport Act. Where a railway line is being closed the Transport Control Board, and subsequently the Public Works Committee, will conduct the appropriate inquiries.

In cases where a rail passenger service will be terminated but freight services will remain, the Transport Control Board will call applications for a road passenger licence, bearing in mind the needs of the district concerned.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone also referred to alterations to railway services without any reference to the Transport Control Board or the Public Works Committee. It is true that the Railways Commissioner is empowered to alter the frequency of railway services. Only one train a week has been operating on the Hallett Cove to Willunga line for some years. During his time as Minister of Transport it appears that the Hon. Mr. Kneebone did not find cause to criticize this action.

Let me again assure the Council that where it is proposed to close a railway line, as distinct from minor alteration in the sense of altering a terminus, the appropriate procedures required by law will be followed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Duration and effect of licence."

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Does the Minister think it advisable to amend the provision of the Act about referring matters such as this to the Public Works Committee? I

agree that, where a major line is to be altered and the amount involved exceeds the \$200,000 prescribed, the matter should be referred to the committee. However, in a minor matter such as this, which is hardly worth the attention of honourable members, it seems to me that an agreement between the Government, the Transport Control Board and the Railways Commissioner is all that is needed. I think we should look closely into whether it is necessary to clutter up the Public Works Committee with matters of such minor import.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not agree with the Hon. Sir Norman Jude. I thank the Minister for his explanation, which to a certain extent has allayed my fears. I agree with the action he is taking regarding the Hallett Cove to Willunga and the Eudunda-Morgan lines, in that these matters will go through the proper channels. The fact that an amount of less than \$200,000 may be involved in either case does not interest me at all. The Transport Control Board should also look at the provision of adequate alternative services, and I think the Minister has given us some assurance that this will be done.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Roads and Transport): I thank Sir Norman for his suggestion but it would be unwise for it to be considered at this juncture by the Government, which has committed itself to making a full inquiry into this whole matter irrespective of the amount involved in the particular closure. There will be no limit to the degree of inquiry that will be held into lines where it is a matter of truly closing them. The essence of such an investigation is the cessation of a service to a particular area, and the matter now before us does not come into that category.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on September 19. Page 1251.)

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on September 19. Page 1252.)

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

### ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on September 19. Page 1253.)

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

### STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 1191.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): Ever since the early days of the State, there have been Acts of Parliament designed to control, eliminate and prevent disease in stock. In 1934 Parliament passed such an Act that consolidated nine different enactments dating from 1888 to 1932. Since 1934 eight different Bills have been introduced to amend the principal Act. Those preceding the present Bill were passed and became law in the years 1941, 1946, 1954, 1956, 1959, 1961 and 1962. These amending Acts altered the provisions contained in the principal Act in various ways considered desirable in view of the experience gained over the intervening years by research into the cause, incidence, eradication and prevention of stock diseases.

For many years before 1956, the short title of the Act was the "Stock and Poultry Diseases Act". In that year the definition of the word "stock" was widened to include poultry, and the short title was amended to the "Stock Diseases Act". In the present Bill the interpretation is further widened to include buffalo, cats, rabbits, pheasants, guinea fowls, parrots and bees. I found when doing my homework on this Bill that, owing to the number of amending enactments passed over the past 34 years, the job was more difficult than it needed to be. I am sure that there are many other Acts in a similar condition. In fact, the Leader referred to one here this afternoon. It is hoped that, as a result of action taken by the Labor Government during its term of office, the South Australian Statutes will soon be printed as a revised edition. That is, of course, if the present Liberal and Country League Government does not capriciously revoke the decision simply because it was a decision of the Labor Government, as it has already done in regard to several other decisions of the previous Labor Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What action have we taken that has been capricious?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The action the Liberal Government has taken regarding

the Industrial Development Advisory Council, the festival hall (which, because it was the Labor Party's suggestion, the Government did not want any part of), and price control. This Government lifted price control from commodities that the Labor Government saw fit to retain under price control. Those are instances where the present Government changed decisions just because they were made by the previous Labor Government.

The Law Book Company Limited was given a contract to revise the South Australian Statutes, and Mr. E. A. Ludovici, who has recently been appointed by Executive Council as Parliamentary Draftsman, was in 1967 appointed Commissioner of Statute Revision. With the approval of the Labor Government, the Law Book Company appointed him editor of the revised edition. I extend my sincere congratulations to Mr. Ludovici, who has proved himself over a strenuous period a most capable and efficient draftsman. I appreciate his assistance to me when I was Minister of Transport and Minister of Labour and Industry in the previous Government. His assistance in drafting Bills and in interpreting the effects of proposed amendments to Bills was of untold benefit to me. I thank him sincerely for his help, and wish him well in his new appointment.

Acts designed to protect a country's stock from disease are of major importance to a country like Australia, as primary industry plays such a large part in our economy. Indeed, Australia has been fortunate in that some of the stock diseases so prevalent and causing such havoc in primary industries in other countries have not become prevalent in this country. This is particularly so in modern times when one considers that the short time taken in air travel, both for humans and stock, brings other countries much closer to Australia. When I say that we are fortunate to have escaped the effects of these diseases, perhaps I am using the wrong word. It would probably be more correct to say that the policy of all Australian Governments towards the problem, and the vigilance of the authorities in regard to quarantine provisions, has resulted in controlling the entry of some of these diseases.

We look with a degree of satisfaction to the fact that two of the most frightening of diseases prevalent in oversea countries (rabies and foot and mouth disease) have so far been kept from our shores. As the Minister has said, an outbreak of rabies could lead to public hysteria. The cry of "mad



dog" has always struck fear into the hearts of the bravest of beings, but in the Middle Ages it caused mass hysteria. It was not until the eminent French chemist and biologist and founder of bacteriology, Louis Pasteur, found a method of inoculation for hydrophobia that some of the mass hysteria in regard to this disease started to abate.

Dogs stricken with this disease fail to respond to normal orders, and often go off on the run, travelling great distances. They snap at any animals or human beings in their path, and the virus in the saliva is transmitted by the bite of a rabid animal. The disease in man is usually known as hydrophobia, because of the fear of water shown by affected persons. This fear is not evident in affected animals. Some specific diseases of domestic animals are confined to one species; others affect several species. Thus, swine fever is a disease affecting pigs only whereas rabies, although most common in dogs, occurs in most species. Up to the present, the policy in regard to imports and quarantine of animals has prevented the spread of rabies to Australia. I do not know whether any dogs held in quarantine in this country have developed the disease during the quarantine period, but it is recorded that from time to time in the British Isles imported dogs under quarantine have developed rabies. Had it not been for the period of quarantine, any one of these animals could have initiated an outbreak of the dread disease in that country. This amply demonstrates the justification for the quarantine policy.

The main provisions of the Bill regarding the control of rabies are contained in clause 6, which is to become section 8b of the principal Act. They are drastic and are designed to prevent or control an outbreak. The Bill empowers the Governor to make proclamations requiring a number of things to be done for these purposes. Among these things is a provision requiring the vaccination of dogs and cats. I am informed that in the British Isles, where there has been no outbreak of this disease for a considerable time, the vaccination policy is not followed and reliance is placed entirely on the quarantine period. Perhaps the Minister could say whether I have been correctly informed. Another proposed proclamation would authorize the destruction of dogs and cats not under the strict control of any person. I should also like the Minister in his reply to say what "strict control" means.

I hope that a proclamation will not be made unless there are sound reasons to suspect that an outbreak of rabies is imminent. I know that at times people are concerned about the number of stray dogs and cats that frequent some areas. However, they can be controlled in ways other than by proclamation of the drastic provisions proposed by clause 6. I believe it is wise to have provisions available in the Act capable of being proclaimed for quick application in an emergency where, despite the quarantine policy, the disease of rabies has been introduced or where it is reasonably expected that an outbreak is imminent. However, I do not believe the provisions proposed by this clause should be proclaimed unless there is a serious threat.

In view of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in England in the past year, I agree that it is wise to further amend the principal Act in regard to foot and mouth disease so that adequate action can be taken should an outbreak occur here. Foot and mouth disease is practically world-wide in its distribution, although Australia and New Zealand are free of it. The virus is the smallest of the viruses causing disease among domestic animals. I am informed that there are three main strains of the virus, but that additional strains have also been found. In countries where the disease has occurred it has been found that the immunity produced in an animal by one strain is not effective against the other strains. Vaccines confer an immunity only against the strain of the virus from which they have been prepared. When vaccines are used the infection is not stamped out, as in the slaughter policy, and it may spread through non-vaccinated cattle to cattle that have recently been vaccinated but have not yet developed immunity, which requires at least 14 days. Where the infection can be promptly and effectively stamped out by the slaughter policy, it has been found in places like the British Isles during the recent epidemic that this is infinitely preferable from the economic point of view. The principal Act provides that the Minister can order such slaughter to be carried out if he is satisfied that stock is diseased. Section 16 is amended to provide that an inspector who previously was authorized to order slaughter of stock has to receive written authority from the Chief Inspector before destroying diseased stock.

As the incubation period of the foot and mouth disease virus is only two to 10 days, I question whether this amendment, which will cause delay while an inspector awaits written

authority from the Chief Inspector, is a step in the right direction, particularly when we realize that the virus can be transported in so many different ways. It can be carried on hides, clothes, boots, packing straw, and other materials. It is almost certain that the recent outbreak in England was caused by the importation of infected carcasses from Argentina, so here is another way in which the disease can be spread.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to the use of dieldrin preparations in controlling lice in sheep. He also referred to the lack of power in the principal Act to prevent its use, despite its injurious effects on meat for human consumption. The sooner the practice referred to is made illegal the better. The Minister also referred to the problems raised by the establishment of diagnostic laboratories by certain drug manufacturers. The Bill provides that diagnostic laboratories are not to be established in this State without the Minister's permission.

In view of the Liberal and Country League Government's generally protective attitude and hands-off policy toward private enterprise, I am agreeably surprised at the Minister's action with regard to drug companies in this State. No doubt the champions of private enterprise in this Council, of whom there is an overwhelming majority, will have something to say in opposition to this proposal.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will be disappointed.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The actions that have brought about the need for this type of control in regard to drug manufacture and sale, whether for stock or for human beings, are a strong condemnation of our way of life, in which the profit motive is placed above all other considerations. Irrespective of whether it is the best treatment for the problem or whether it is injurious to human beings or stock, more money seems to be poured into promoting a product than into properly testing its effects or side effects.

Many tragedies have occurred in the treatment of human beings because of this policy. We still have with us today, and will have for a long time to come, ghastly reminders of the lack of adequate testing of the side effects of a certain drug administered to expectant mothers not many years ago. Drug manufacturing companies should not be permitted to market new products, whether for human beings or for stock, until they have been adequately tested by an authority such as the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. I am pleased that the Bill does make some attempt to control the activities of drug firms. Although I am concerned about some of its provisions, I support the second reading.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.36 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 25, at 2.15 p.m.