

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

Thursday, July 23, 1970

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

**PORT AUGUSTA TO WHYALLA RAILWAY AGREEMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

**QUESTIONS****CLEVE VETERINARY OFFICER**

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 16 about the appointment of a veterinary officer at Cleve?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Director of Agriculture expects to transfer a district inspector of stock to Cleve during the next six weeks to fill the vacant position there. However, with regard to veterinary staff, as I pointed out to the honourable member previously, qualified veterinary officers are in extremely short supply. In fact, urgent investigation work is being delayed because vacancies in the approved establishment of veterinary staff cannot be filled; in these circumstances I regret that the prospects of stationing a veterinary officer in the Cleve area in the foreseeable future are remote. Nevertheless, the needs of this district will be kept in mind and, should the position improve sufficiently, further consideration will be given to the provision of an officer for Cleve.

**BOLIVAR EFFLUENT**

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I directed through him to the Minister of Works last week relating to the use of Bolivar effluent?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has furnished the following information:

Three important propositions for the use of large quantities of effluent water from Bolivar are now being examined by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. These are receiving urgent attention. While some types of vegetable production can be approved using effluent water irrigation, there are others to which a clearance cannot be given.

**WEEDS**

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 15 regarding weeds on main highways?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The division of responsibility for noxious weed control on major roads, highways and freeways is a problem which is at present under review by the Weeds Advisory Committee. In fact, discussions took place between that committee and the Highways Department during 1969 in efforts to resolve the difficulties which have arisen, with the development of major highways and freeways, in weed control on roadsides. I am advised that the Weeds Advisory Committee will shortly submit a report on this matter and on subsidies for noxious weed control, and I shall certainly give sympathetic consideration to any recommendations the committee might make to rectify situations where local landholders have unfair responsibilities for control measures.

**ABORTIONS**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question relates to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Act of last year concerning abortions. Section 82A (5) deals with conscientious objection by any person called upon to assist in such an operation. I point out that there are probably three phases in an operation (pre-operative, the operation itself, and post-operative care) where different fields of responsibility lie. It has been brought to my notice that in some instances persons have found themselves assisting at such an operation without knowing beforehand what was about to take place. As some people with a conscientious objection feel very strongly about this matter, first, will the Chief Secretary look at this aspect to see that some statutory responsibility is placed upon either the medical officer concerned or somebody in a position of authority to ensure that all persons assisting in the operation are fully informed of what is taking place and, secondly, will he obtain an opinion on the legal and ethical responsibility of a person should he or she discontinue assisting after finding out that such an operation was being performed?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to get a report along these lines but, since I have been in office, I have not had this aspect of the matter brought to my notice. It is fair to say there has been some publicity about a certain hospital, which is not according to fact. At that hospital, the position is that no nurse or sister is expected or compelled

to play any part in the preparations prior to the operation or to go to the operating theatre but, when the patient is taken back to the ward or room after the operation, this hospital expects its nurses or sisters in the normal course of their duties to take care of her.

I have discussed this matter with the department, which thinks that it is a very fair assessment of the position. However, now that the question of a legal opinion has been raised—I think the hospital involved has taken what I consider to be a reasonable attitude—and now that an inquiry is requested into what happens regarding a person with a conscientious objection to being involved in any way in that type of operation, I shall be happy to find out what the legal position is and bring down a report. I hope the honourable member will acknowledge the fact that this may take some time to do.

#### DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The PRESIDENT: I notice in the gallery Mr. Tom Koraea, M.P., member for Kikori in the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea. I extend to Mr. Koraea a very warm welcome and ask the Chief Secretary and the Hon. R. C. DeGaris to conduct Mr. Koraea to a chair on the floor of the Council.

Mr. Koraea was escorted by the Hon. A. J. Shard and the Hon. R. C. DeGaris to a seat on the floor of the Council.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 22. Page 191.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so, I join with those honourable members who have spoken before me in congratulating His Excellency the Governor's Deputy (Sir Mellis Napier) on his opening of Parliament a week ago. Sir Mellis is a man who is held in high esteem in South Australia. The country of his birth has many famous exports, but most people would perhaps be surprised to know that its most famous of all exports is its manpower, that is, its sons and daughters. In Sir Mellis, I think this State has an outstanding example of Scotland's produce.

I express regret for the reason why Sir Mellis should have had to open Parliament this year. All honourable members would send respectful sympathy to Sir James and

Lady Harrison and wish Sir James a speedy recovery and return to his duties, duties which he has undertaken so conscientiously, for which we all respect him. I wish to greet the new Government, especially the three Ministers in the Council and, more especially, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. M. Casey), who came to us from another place.

The leading export of this country, and this State in particular, is primary produce. Yesterday afternoon the Hon. Mr. Kemp pressed home the problems facing these industries. At the same time, yesterday, the rural march through the streets of Adelaide highlighted the problems of those people engaged in primary industries. The march emphasized the human problems as well as the economic problems, neither of which can be fully understood and appreciated by those people who live entirely in a city environment. For a long time to come, whatever we think about secondary industries and their growth, primary industries must remain the backbone of this country in general and of this State in particular.

Part of Asia has been called the rice bowl of the world. Australia and other similar primary-producing countries could fairly have been called in the past and even today the wheat, meat and wool centres of the world; between them they make up the bread basket, the meat safe and the clothing wardrobe of the world. Although the proportions vary, we, with similar countries, must still continue to accept that role in a world that consists of two-thirds rice eaters who eat less than their needs of protein in the form of meat. These people must increase their intake of meat from exporting countries, which should include Australia. In common with other honourable members, I wish to see our rural people secure a fair share of Australia's increasing prosperity, a fair return on their investment, and a fair reward for their labours.

I now turn to some of the individual points in His Excellency's Speech. Paragraph 4 states:

My Government is determined that forward planning is undertaken with all our water resources so as to ensure that all possible water resources available to this State are harnessed and developed to the fullest extent possible.

Water has been called water of life, and it is indeed that: more than 90 per cent of our body weight is water, and that proportion no Government or committee can vary or control by legislation. It can neither add to nor detract from the internal needs of a human being and

his requirement, although naturally the source of that water can be affected and influenced in various ways. Clean and clear water is vital if we are to sustain life, that is, if we are to sustain it biologically, chemically, industrially, socially and hygienically. When we think of water in this State we naturally think first of the Murray River. This mighty river must be kept flowing at an adequate rate. It must have a suitable chemical constitution and a suitable degree of purity. It must be free from contamination whether by industrial or domestic pollution or by high salt content.

We must see that it does not have an inadequate flow arising from an insufficient supply from its sources relative to the withdrawal of water on its passage to the sea. These problems all lead to the same disastrous results—death to crops and stock, water-borne diseases and water that is unfit for general use from the viewpoint of quality or quantity. For this reason the Dartmouth dam is a must, and it should be constructed as soon as possible. The Chowilla dam, as a future probability or even possibility, must not be allowed to delay provision for our immediate needs. In the South-East, water gushes from the ground—lucky people! Harnessing these resources must ensure a degree of security in respect of water supplies for that area.

In paragraph 10 of His Excellency's Speech we are told that the State Government has notified the Commonwealth Government of its intention to withdraw from the responsibility of meeting the education requirements of the Northern Territory. This is understandable; we have a shortage of teachers and the withdrawal step was planned in case it should become necessary. However, it is somewhat ironical that we are withdrawing our help from the Northern Territory when, at the same time, we are making vigorous efforts to siphon off teachers from some other countries, where teachers are in short supply, too.

There is a world shortage of trained teachers, yet this country and other countries are all engaged in a system of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I wonder where this process will end. Is it not time that thought was given to creating a central pool of teachers, say, through the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization? Teachers of all grades who wish to travel could register and be pooled. A teacher's desire to travel could then be weighed against the needs and resources of various countries.

In one breath we stress our responsibility as a prosperous State in a prosperous country to help under-developed countries—and trained teachers are very necessary in such countries. This same idea is voiced, too, in America, Canada, Great Britain and other nations, yet we all spend our time trying to attract from each other one and the same thing—skilled, trained personnel, which none of us can afford to release. If we do have to release such personnel, we seek replacements from another needy source.

The withdrawal of teachers from the Northern Territory must inevitably heighten someone else's shortage. We need more staff and buildings for schools, technical training facilities and universities. The whole world, because of under-development or because of a desire to keep up with the Joneses, seeks ever more education, regardless of the degree of advancement a particular country may enjoy at present.

I sometimes wonder what this State's ultimate goal is. Are we, as a reasonably advanced State in a reasonably advanced country, aiming to provide a nobler culture and a higher standard of citizenship, or have we in mind simply the production of a better equipped race of rats to compete in the race with fellow rats from other States and overseas? Why do we want language laboratories, bigger and more fully stocked libraries, swimming pools and canteen shells? If it is to train better citizens, then let us give at least equal thought, if not more thought, to the need to counter the moral, visual and verbal pollution that is progressively and increasingly condoned and endorsed nowadays. Such thought is necessary if our young people are to receive more than a sound material foundation on which to build their future. Good community standards are vital. These in turn promote the future well-being of coming generations.

Paragraph 23 of His Excellency's Speech deals with the nursing profession. I refer to this profession because I come into closer contact with nurses than does anyone else in this Parliament, except for one member in another place. In thinking of trainee nursing personnel, I would say that too much is expected of young girls who are too young for the responsibilities they have to accept. This situation is not and cannot be rectified simply by the provision of more money. For one thing, it requires more senior and trained staff for supervision. This can be helped to a certain degree by more money, by

remuneration for the trained staff sufficient to prevent them from being tempted away to more lucrative but perhaps less rewarding centres of work.

Conditions for training juniors are important. Given a sound professional training in a good environment by skilled people and the assurance that once they are trained their income will be commensurate with their status and responsibility, girls entering the nursing profession will recognize that their prospects lie, as with all forward-looking people, in the future. That is when the nurse's real worth becomes of greatest value to the State. I fully recognize that that statement is an oversimplification of the problem. However, it is no more oversimplified than the idea held by some that, by paying more money to more people, the solutions to all problems can be found.

This Government, like every other Government, is faced with the increasing problem of the taking of drugs, both in respect of type and quantity. Paragraph 24 of His Excellency's Speech states:

My Government will take action to bring to the notice of all persons the harmful effects of the taking of drugs without medical supervision.

It would not be sufficient simply to say that; therefore, it goes on to say:

Measures will be introduced to provide for severe penalties for those who illegally distribute drugs.

It is more than harmful, as His Excellency's Speech states—it can be absolutely disastrous. It is equally naive to talk about alcohol and cigarette smoking being prevalent and, therefore, there being justification for youngsters to take drugs at orgies or privately. Paragraph 31 of His Excellency's Speech stated:

The Government will proceed with the distribution to councils and others of the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee and will work towards the introduction of a Bill for a new Act following receipt of comments from these bodies.

I am glad that the Government only says that it will work towards the introduction of a Bill. I am glad about this because the paragraph goes on to refer to adult suffrage and compulsory voting at council elections. To me, there are few things more objectionable and out-of-keeping in a community such as ours at any level. I will have more to say on this matter later. It is dictatorial to compel any person to go to the polls on election day.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: One may say, then, that the Legislative Council is the only truly democratic House in Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Take your tongue out of your cheek.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: With one breath the Premier has shocked a considerable section of the community by saying he would urge any young man to break the law which provides for compulsory national service to defend his country.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He did not actually say that, you know.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Are you defending him?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes. He did not say what the Hon. Mr. Springett has said.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: With the next breath the Premier's Government wants to extend the same degree of compulsion to everybody to vote at all levels. I think members here will know that our system is regarded with surprise, bordering on dismay, that a country so advanced compels its citizens to attend at the polling booths. I have often known an opinion cast in the way desired by the elector by his staying away from the poll, for that can be just as positive an expression of opinion as any other. I am sure that the Government would not be at all surprised, should such a Bill become law, if many people deliberately stayed away from a polling booth. I will have more to say on this matter in the future.

A large number of the measures referred to relate to changes contemplated in the laws of the State. The question of capital punishment, for instance, is sure to produce conflicting views, and as one who has witnessed hangings officially I have my own opinions, which will be stated at a more appropriate time. I am very glad that increasing emphasis is to be placed upon the curative and preventive aspects of dealing with offenders against the law, for this is in keeping with modern thought and practice the world over.

With all these things, over-riding all, inevitably as in any family which seeks to plan its activities, is the cost and how these things will all budget out. The previous Government cannot be accused of leaving the books in the red. Indeed, the reverse is true and it deserves the thanks and congratulations of Parliament as a whole and the present Government—its successor—in particular. A solvent community is needed for wise Government. Again like a family, to live beyond one's means may be desirable and in a very short term may be necessary, but to burn up the income wildly always leads to restlessness, disillusionment and a withdrawal of stable

industries, and this in turn leads to a drying up of that vital income commodity: new citizens from overseas. We have had that experience in this State before.

May I finish my remarks by referring to the Good Neighbour Council, which last week celebrated its 21st birthday, and, in referring to it, pay a tribute to it for its work in assisting newcomers to full integration. This integration is a process of gradual fulfilment, so gradual that four or five years ago I saw some paintings, including those by the late Sir Hans Heysen, exhibited in a show of New Australian works. About the same time there was another exhibition by Australian artists and he was included in this, so he comes into both categories. Likewise, Sir Mellis Napier comes into both categories, and so do countless thousands of humbler folk. As I see it, this State will prosper only so long as all sections of the community are regarded as equal in value and in worth, and so long as its Government of whatever complexion politically cares for the needs of the people in that community. I support the motion.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I first wish to affirm my loyalty to the Crown and to Her Majesty the Queen, and I am sure that this is the feeling of the great majority of South Australians. I join with other speakers in congratulating the Governor's Deputy (Sir Mellis Napier) upon delivering the Speech in this House recently and also upon his very long and outstanding service to South Australia. Sir Mellis has officiated as Lieutenant-Governor or as Governor's Deputy on countless occasions in this State when the Governor has been either absent or unwell, and I believe that in length of time his service runs into about eight years. Of course, he has previously served the State for very many years as Chief Justice, and we do honour Sir Mellis for the service which he has given to South Australia.

I should also like to say how pleased I am that His Excellency the Governor (Sir James Harrison) is continuing to progress after the effects of his illness, and I am sure that I am joined by all honourable members, some of whom have already expressed these sentiments, in expressing hope for his complete recovery to full health and strength. We hope that His Excellency the Governor will be back with us very soon.

The Address in Reply to the Speech of Sir James Harrison in April was adopted

formally and without discussion, and there was no opportunity at that time to express regret at the passing of two distinguished Parliamentarians. I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without referring briefly to the service of Sir Robert Nicholls, who was a member of the other House for over 40 years and who was a very distinguished Speaker in that House for well over 20 years. I express my appreciation of the service which Sir Robert gave. I had the privilege of knowing him personally. I also wish to convey my condolences to his relatives. Mr. Colin Dunnage was a member of the other House for many years and Chairman of Committees for six years, and I had the opportunity of knowing him as well. I convey my condolences to his family.

Before getting on to the main content of His Excellency's Speech, I wish to refer to one or two other matters. I should like to refer particularly to the retirement of several members of Parliament who completed their service in the last Parliament, all of whom I think did a very conscientious job but two of whom I should like to refer to particularly. First, I wish to mention the Hon. Stanley Bevan, who was a member of this Council and a former Minister of Roads, Local Government, and Mines. Although he was a political opponent of my Party, he was a personal friend of us all. I should like to place on record my appreciation of the association that I had with Mr. Bevan. My great regret is that he had to retire (I think that phrase puts it correctly). In fact, I asked him at one stage, "How is your strong right arm?" and he said, "Well, it has been broken." I am very sorry to know that the Hon. Stanley Bevan left this place, as I thought, a little earlier than he should have done. I record my appreciation of the association that I had with him and the assistance that he gave to all members, I think, regardless of political colour, while he was a Minister.

Also, I refer particularly to a gentleman from the other House who was one of nature's gentlemen, who served that House with distinction for 26 years, and who graced the office of Speaker for six years. With great respect, I think that possibly the term "gracing the office of Speaker" has not actually applied since he left that office. I refer to the Hon. B. H. Teusner, who was the member for the old District of Angas for, as I have said, 26 years. He was a colleague of long standing and a gentleman who served his constituents with distinction and very conscientiously over

many years. I pay this tribute to him for the service he gave to the State.

I congratulate the Government, although I cannot become enthusiastic about it. Naturally, I should prefer to see my own Party in Government but, having seen the results of the election, I congratulate the Government, and particularly the members of its Party in this Council, on winning the last election. I say, possibly with some limitation imposed by my own desire to see my own Party in power, that I am glad to see the Hon. Mr. Shard and the Hon. Mr. Kneebone back on the Government benches as Ministers. I also welcome the Hon. Mr. Casey, a new member of this Council, who served in another place for 10 or 11 years.

The Government was fortunate to win nearly 60 per cent of the seats in another place with a little more than 50 per cent of the votes. That interests me because, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, in 1965 it won 55 per cent of the seats in another place with 52 per cent of the votes—a 3 per cent discrepancy in its favour under the old system. Yet, with this new system which is supposedly better and more equitable, the discrepancy between the number of seats won and the actual votes is about 7 per cent or 8 per cent. Of course, there have been no complaints from the Government about this; it complains only when things go the other way.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was your Bill that brought it about.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Of course, the honourable member will have his say. With his usual anxiety to say something, he will talk from time to time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He is correct.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not necessarily accept that point. With reference to this matter, the Hon. Mr. Shard interjected when the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was speaking. His interjection appears at page 67 of *Hansard* as follows:

What about the percentage of the vote in 1968? We had 52 per cent, but did not govern.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said:

That is quite true, but once again—and then he was interrupted again. That statement was not quite correct. It was true enough that it did not govern, but the Labor Party did not get 52 per cent of the vote on that occasion; it got that only once, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, in 1965 when, as I mentioned earlier, it got 55 per cent of the seats. In 1968 the A.L.P. got 50.7 per cent

of the total vote and 48 per cent of the seats in another place, the discrepancy there also being less than 3 per cent. That was under the old system, admittedly; of course, it was against the A.L.P., and that is what caused the scream at the time.

It can be summed up as follows. In the 1969 Commonwealth election, under the so-called one vote one value system, with admittedly a possible tolerance of 20 per cent, the A.L.P. got 66 per cent of the seats with a 51 per cent vote. This was a 15 per cent difference, but once again there were no complaints. In 1970, in the recent election under the new State system, the A.L.P. got 58 per cent of the seats with less than 51 per cent of the vote, which is a difference of 7 per cent—and again there were no complaints. So we have a difference of 15 per cent and 7 per cent under the new so-called better systems and only 3 per cent and 2.7 per cent under the old South Australian system, which was referred to for a long time as a gerrymander. Anyhow, it is obvious that, with systems that some people believe to be great improvements, results can be obtained that are far from satisfactory. I do not wish to dwell on this matter further; the Hon. Mr. Banfield can put his case in due course.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I will put you right then.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The honourable member can correct me, according to his beliefs, if he likes, but I have mentioned the facts.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I know what the facts are but I want the truth. We have had a lie and a half.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not accept that the facts I have given are a lie and a half. If the honourable member wishes to talk about lies, we could have some further discussion about that, but I shall not discuss this matter further for the time being. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. DeGaris on his speech and endorse very much what he said.

I now refer to some things in His Excellency's Speech, but not necessarily in order. I take first the paragraph dealing with local government. I have a great admiration for a considerable number of people who serve in local government and they have gained much experience and wisdom through their work, which has been of great value to the community. I am sorry to see in the Speech that the present Government intends to bring down legislation about compulsory voting and

compulsory enrolment for local government voting. Paragraph 31 states:

The most significant amendments are aimed at enabling councils to enter the field of services to the aged, providing adult suffrage and compulsory voting at council elections.

I have no complaint about local government entering the field of services to the aged if it thinks it is a good thing, but I believe there is no call whatsoever for providing adult suffrage and compulsory voting at council elections. I had the privilege of serving for a number of years on a council—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is there anything democratic about compulsory voting?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I cannot see that there is. All it means is that people come along to vote at State, Commonwealth and now possibly local government elections who have given no serious thought to the issues involved, and in a close fight these uninformed opinions sometimes affect the result. That is not a good thing.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Your Commonwealth Leader does not agree with that.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not always agree with my Commonwealth Leader; I can disagree if I wish. In 1965, the Hon. Stan Bevan appointed the Local Government Act Revision Committee, which did a very good job over a period of years in reporting on the desirability of a new Local Government Act. To my knowledge, there is no recommendation whatsoever from that committee for compulsory voting and compulsory enrolment for local government voting. I believe that in bringing this matter forward the new Government is introducing something that is contrary to the opinion of the committee which it set up. I am opposed to it because I believe that it will bring politics into local government. Having had 14 years' experience in that sphere, I am sure that this would be a retrograde step. It would be a bad thing if politics were to be brought into local government, and I will oppose that proposition when the necessary legislation is introduced.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: So will local government.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am sure that local government will oppose it because it knows of the situation in which it has been working for many years and in which it has done work of very great value to this State. I suggest that the Government have another look at this matter because it would be wise for it to take more notice of the report which, I believe, has been presented by the committee.

I do not think it would be a good thing, for the reasons outlined, to have compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for local government. What could also happen under this scheme could be the depriving of a vote to people who support local government by paying rates and who happen to live over the fence in the next local government area.

I wish to mention agriculture, but I do not want to speak at length on this matter because it has been dealt with in detail by other honourable members and discussed at considerable length yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Kemp. However, I wish to underline the difficulties that face primary producers at present. The accent was placed on these by the march held yesterday and by marches that have been held elsewhere. Whether or not one agrees with yesterday's march, the difficulties are very real. I ask the Government to consider the present plight of primary producers and ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider the situation that faces them. I am heartened to know that the Minister is sympathetic and I am glad to know that the Premier made statements yesterday that could lead one to believe that the Government is not unaware of the difficulties facing agriculture and that it is prepared to consider these at the appropriate time. One paragraph in the Opening Speech concerns me, particularly the reference to agricultural estates. Paragraph 45 of the Opening Speech states:

Legislation will be introduced to remove anomalies in the law relating to receipt duty and gift duty and to alter the incidence of succession duties to give remissions to a spouse inheriting a house, to the inheritors of small estates and primary producing property. Other special remissions will be removed . . .

However, the paragraph then continues, "Successions will be aggregated and rates on larger successions will be increased." I venture to suggest that the words "successions will be aggregated and rates on larger successions will be increased" will more than cancel out some of the promises of remissions made in paragraph 45 of the Speech. During the election campaign (I think it was in the *News* of May 6), Mr. Dunstan was reported to have said that he intended to obtain another \$4,500,000 from succession duties.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think it is an impossibility to fulfil all the promises?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, unless the Government first fulfils them, then takes them away by aggregation and other means. This would more than cancel out many of the promises in paragraph 45.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You would be guessing?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Perhaps, but I would be interested to know how the Government could get another \$4,500,000 in succession duties when the present gross receipts from succession duty are about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000; this would mean an average increase of about 50 per cent. If many of the remissions suggested in paragraph 45 are provided, the Government will have to collect this money, and there are certainly not sufficient large estates in South Australia for it to be able to collect another \$4,500,000. I can only conclude that the aggregation suggested will mean that succession duties in South Australia will no longer be succession duties but will become (as they have become in the Commonwealth sphere) an estate duty, and this would more than cancel out the small benefits that may appear to be present in the earlier part of paragraph 45. This would be a retrograde step for the State and would be the opposite of helping the primary producers, who are now in a very difficult situation.

Regarding irrigation, I shall restrict my remarks to the Adelaide Plains and the area within a few miles of Virginia—the market garden centre for the city of Adelaide. I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question recently regarding the amount of the drain on the Adelaide Plains underground basin at present, the estimated amount of recharge (which is only a fraction of the amount of water being taken out) and the amount of water allowed to run out to sea from the Bolivar treatment works. I asked the Minister to examine further the possibility of using this water because I cannot see for the life of me how at present, or even within the next few years, this industry could be shifted. I cannot see, either, how enough water can be reticulated from the Murray River via the South Para reservoir or from any other source to reduce the amount of draw-off from the basin to a safe level.

I believe it is necessary to use reclaimed water or effluent that is being channelled from the Bolivar works and allowed to flow out to sea. I have been asked not to call it "effluent", and that is fair enough, as I believe that the word "effluent" has a meaning that we always tend to associate with sewage works. The word has gained this meaning by being used this way perhaps more than any other way. The word actually means flowing forth, and flowing from a larger stream or lake.

However, it has this tendency to be associated with sewage works.

Whether the water that runs from Bolivar out to the sea is called effluent or reclaimed water perhaps does not matter very much, but it is vitally necessary to use it, where possible, and to reduce the drain on the Adelaide Plains basin, unless market gardening in this district is to face chaos in the near future. I know that this creates many problems, and I am not suggesting to the Government that something can be done overnight, because people have been looking into this matter for a long time. The problem is to use this effluent or reclaimed water on the types of vegetable on which it is safe to be used and to ensure that growers do not use it on those vegetables on which it is not safe to be used.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you think that is practicable?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is the difficulty that must be overcome. However, if it is not practicable, I should like to know just what other solution there is in avoiding the complete drainage of this basin and the inflow of seawater. Of course, in every other respect Virginia, being only 18 miles away, is in an ideal position to supply Adelaide with vegetables. It is in a much better position than a location alongside the Murray River would be. The cost of shifting the industry would be enormous and beyond the resources of the Government. A detailed case for the use of reclaimed water has been placed before the Minister of Works by the Chairman of the Munno Para District Council (Mr. R. K. Baker). I am aware that some problems still have to be solved, but I do ask the Chief Secretary, representing the Government, to see that the Government seriously considers the matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can rest assured that the Government is giving every attention to the problem and is trying its best to seek a solution.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am pleased to hear that, because this matter is beyond the realm of Party politics. I should like to pay a tribute for the interest shown in this problem by the member for Goyder (Mr. Ferguson) in another place, by my colleagues representing the Midland District, and by the Hon. Mr. Kemp, who has brought his specialized knowledge to bear on the problem.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Hon. Mr. Bevan showed concern, too.



The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I appreciate what the Hon. Mr. Bevan did while he was a member of this Council. Paragraph 32 of His Excellency's Speech says that the Government will legislate to make the age of majority 18 years. This is a somewhat doubtful proposition, because young people are not sufficiently mature at 18 years. I have heard it said that nowadays young people are more mature at 18 years of age than they were 30 years ago, but I cannot agree with this proposition. I would agree that they are more educated theoretically, but I suggest that most young people are at school or university at 18 years of age and are still putting their hands out to their mothers and fathers for sustenance. They have not had the opportunity to gain the sense of responsibility that can be gained only when a person is out in the world earning his own living and trying to make ends meet. Thirty years ago young people of 18 years of age had to work during the day and study at night. Therefore, I question whether the Government's plan to make the age of majority 18 years is wise. Paragraph 37 of His Excellency's Speech says:

Legislation is under consideration whereby courts will be given the right to investigate contracts and, where the parties have no equality in bargaining power, they will be empowered, if it is just and equitable, to set aside or re-write a contract to ensure fairness and equal terms.

I do not know what sort of confusion will be created when a court is given the opportunity to re-write a contract. I will be interested to see the details of the legislation but at present I cannot raise any enthusiasm for it. Paragraph 38 of His Excellency's Speech says that the Government will ask Parliament to appoint another Select Committee to examine the so-called points demerit scheme. I do not oppose this plan because there is some merit in the points demerits scheme. I was not completely in favour of it when it was first brought before this Council because I thought it was a little too drastic in some respects. However, at the same time I believe the Government is probably on the right track in investigating this matter further, no doubt with the intention of improving road safety.

Paragraphs 10 to 16 of His Excellency's Speech all deal with education. I would not quarrel with this emphasis because we all realize that we must do more for education. When the Hon. R. R. Loveday was Minister of Education he often said that the State was doing all it possibly could and that it must

receive more assistance. However, when I receive letters from members of the South Australian Institute of Teachers I wonder whether they realize that we are still on earth and not in heaven. Some of the things they ask for would be very nice if we had unlimited money. We must draw the line between fantasy and realism and provide those things that are necessary for a continuance of a broad education in the State.

I commend the Government for its proposal related to drugs that is detailed in paragraph 24 of His Excellency's Speech. I hope it will lessen the drug menace that exists in our country. We should be very thankful that the menace does not exist in Australia to the same extent that it exists overseas. However, we would be closing our eyes to the facts if we did not realize that drug-taking is assuming alarming proportions in this country and, if allowed to go unchecked, it will have a detrimental effect on our people and on their moral fibre.

I am pleased that the Government will adopt the proposal detailed in paragraph 46 of His Excellency's Speech with reference to increased housing loans. The Opposition had intended to carry out this plan had it been returned to office. The Government has already authorized an increase from \$8,000 to \$9,000 in the maximum housing loan that may be made from funds secured under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. I am glad to see that the Government is making this sound move.

Paragraph 47 of His Excellency's Speech says that the Consolidated Revenue Account showed a surplus of nearly \$3,000,000. I am pleased to see that the last Government, which I supported, had this State's finances in good condition when it went out of office. As a result of that financial position the present Government should be able to go from there and do something worthwhile for the State.

I think there is a real need to reduce land tax along the lines suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, because this is another means of relief for our people on the land today. The situation at present calls for a cure, and a cure for the troubles of the primary producer will not be found overnight. The immediate need is for some measures of relief that will enable the primary producer to remain on his property and to continue to be of service to the State, because I am sure that if primary producers leave their properties and other people who have no experience get on them the situation will go from bad to worse.

I have discussed most of the matters that I wished to bring before the notice of the Government. There are other things that were mentioned by other members, so I will refrain from commenting on those because I do not wish to delay the Council further. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency in opening Parliament. I congratulate the new Government on its election to office, and I congratulate also the Ministers of this Council on their appointment. I also wish to congratulate the previous Ministers in the previous Government in this Council who I think performed excellently and added a good deal of prestige to their respective offices. Although they happen to be sitting on the Opposition benches at the moment, I consider that their record as Ministers and the record of their administration will remain for a very long time to come. If I may say so, I think the people of South Australia did not quite fully realize the excellent administration that they had in the Hall Government, and possibly it will be a short time before this is appreciated and a correct assessment made. I think people will then appreciate the position.

To me it is a matter of very great regret that some of the faces I have seen in this place over the years are not here at present. I refer particularly to the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson, who served this Parliament with distinction for a number of years. I pay my tribute to him and congratulate him on being recognized by Her Majesty for the work that he did. I also endorse very sincerely the comments made this afternoon with regard to the Hon. Mr. Tuesner, who is one of nature's gentlemen; he brought dignity to the position of Speaker, and if I might make a suggestion it would be that I hope the powers that be will realize the worth of his work to this Parliament and make a recommendation to Her Majesty regarding some distinction in recognition of his service.

I wish to mention also the Hon. Mr. Hutchens, the Hon. Mr. Riches and the Hon. Mr. Loveday, all of whom retired from the other House after very worthwhile service there. I express my appreciation for their work. I also wish to mention the Hon. Mr. Bevan, who is not now in this place. I mention him because of the assistance that he gave me as a member of the Industries Development Committee during the time that I was Chairman of that committee. I could always rely on his

support and co-operation, and he assisted greatly in his quiet way in assessing the issues involved. I had respect for his ability, and I wish to place that respect on record. I should also like to mention the help I received on that committee from Mr. Hughes and Mr. Freebairn. It was a very compact committee, and I do not think that we had any serious disagreements. Certainly, politics were never brought into the issues that were involved. I can say that the time that I spent on the committee working with these people was most enjoyable, and I think we were able to make some decisions that were of benefit to the State.

We now have a new Government, and consequent on that we have a new Minister in this Council in the person of the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr. Casey. I feel that he will fit in with the atmosphere of this Council and that he will realize that it works somewhat differently from the other House. I assure the Minister of my co-operation in the management of the Council.

It is obvious that when there is a new Government there is a change of emphasis, a change of policy and a change of outlook. Whilst I congratulate the new Government, it seems to me a little unfortunate that in the new Government in the Assembly there are virtually only two members that represent truly country districts—the members for Millicent and Chaffey. This means that there is not a great deal of country voice in the Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't you call Stuart and Whyalla country?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I call Stuart and Whyalla country industrial electorates, and this is somewhat different from primary producing electorates. The point I am making is that the voice of country interests is not nearly as strong in this Government as it was for many years, and under this redistribution it will not be so in the future. As one who represents an electorate with a considerable country constituency, I am sorry that this has happened, because I think it tremendously important that any Government should represent, on a more or less equal basis, a cross-section of the whole of the community. When a Government is biased, whether it be too far to the trade union side, too far to what is called the conservative side, or with a loading in any particular direction, it is an unfortunate thing for the people, and I am afraid that this is the situation at the present time as far as the country people are concerned.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Obviously, the farmers suffered as a result of having too much representation for a number of years.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If I may say so, that is not a comment that is based on fact. The farmers have suffered because of unfortunate economic conditions. I think it is true to say that the degree of suffering that the farmers are experiencing at present is not fully appreciated in this Parliament or in other places where they are entitled to have their case heard. In the course of my work I have the opportunity to see detailed statements regarding many farmers' affairs, and the truth is that in many instances they are facing difficulties which they will find hard to surmount. It will be unfortunate if they do not get understanding and sympathetic consideration in the places where it really matters, because there are ways in which a Government can help them, and help them very effectively. Consequently, it is unfortunate that the Liberal Government was not returned, because part of our policy was a reduction of a further 30 per cent in the incidence of succession duties for farmers.

Under the Playford Government, we made provision that the rate of duty would be reduced by 30 per cent on land which had been used for primary production and which was to be so used in the future and, if I understand the situation correctly, the policy speech of Mr. Hall provided that there was to be a further 30 per cent reduction. This was something that was very tangible and something that would have been a very great help. As the Hall Government was not returned, that went overboard.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It would not help the Rundle Street farmers.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not terribly interested in them. It would help the genuine farmer, the person with whom I am concerned, and it is unfortunate that that concession has gone overboard.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Even a Rundle Street farmer is affected.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes. Mr. Hall's other proposal was to gradually phase out land tax for farmers. This would have been a great help, but this now will not happen. As far as I can see, these are about the only two areas in which a State Government can help the primary-production section of the community. This was a tangible expression of what we proposed to do. There are concession rates for rail freights, and there may be some concessions as regards wharfage rates

in support of the farming community, but what the present Government's policy in these matters will be remains to be seen. I do not think it will be as sympathetic as we hoped for.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It acted quickly at Port Giles, anyway.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, it acted quickly there and I commend it for doing that. I am pleased that the results of the deputation about Port Giles have come about so quickly. It means now that, if somebody applies to the Government for the construction of a deep sea port, the question whether it will be economic and will pay for itself or not will not be considered, because we have not done that with Port Giles. I do not detract from what the Government has done; in fact, I congratulate it on acting so quickly. I am pleased it has learnt so quickly from the last time a Labor Government was in office, when it took a long time to proceed.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We do not mess around.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I congratulate the people who organized the farmers' march yesterday on the orderly way in which it was conducted and the orderly procedure followed throughout the whole march. I do not know that this would be my idea of the way to bring problems before the people who matter but, in my opinion, there was no complaint about the way in which the march was conducted, which was in great contradistinction to some marches we have had to contend with in South Australia recently.

Dealing with the situation of the farming community, I have taken the trouble to get out some facts and figures about realizations of wheat and barley pools. I look now at the annual report of the Australian Wheat Board for the year 1968-69, the last report I have available. I am reading from page 40, on which appear statements of the payments to growers over a period of years. This shows that the net realizations have not been quite as satisfactory as perhaps we could have hoped for. Looking at No. 14 pool, we find that the average receipt a bushel of wheat is up as high as 170.416c, and in pool No. 19 it has dropped down to 130.757c a bushel. In pool No. 25, it went up to 144.155c, and in pool No. 28, the last one for which I have a figure, the net realization was 133.968c a bushel. These do not show a very big decline in net realizations and, if that was the whole story, the farming situation would not be so bad; but the position is complicated

because of the introduction of the quota system. Also, it has been made worse by the fact that we have a fairly substantial guaranteed first advance on wheat, which has had the effect of pushing up the production of wheat rather dramatically.

I do not want to give the Australian figures, but I do want to give the South Australian figures. In the No. 26 pool, which was in the 1962-63 season, we delivered to the board in South Australia 35,120,000 bushels. That increased in the 1963-64 season to 51,660,000 bushels, and it leapt up in the 1968-69 season to 79,446,000 bushels. Taking Australia as a whole, the deliveries to the Wheat Board for 1963-64 amounted to 307,836,000 bushels, and in the 1968-69 season they leapt up to 515,616,000 bushels. So that production has increased dramatically, which has meant that the quota system has had to be introduced. This is what is causing grave problems for the farming community today, but I do not see that any other course could have been adopted than the introduction of a quota system, which ultimately will iron out the problems of over-production. But, inevitably, there will be some farmers who will suffer greatly under that system.

The Government has said that it is looking at this matter and appointing a committee to investigate it, but how successful it will be in ironing out these problems still remains to be seen. I am inclined to think that, in total, rather too pessimistic a view is being taken by financial institutions and by the farmers themselves about the overall situation. I think the position will not turn out to be so bad as was anticipated.

While I am dealing with figures, I should like to refer to the 1969 annual report of the Australian Barley Board, and particularly to figures that appear on page 35 of that report.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is nice to see the Minister taking such an interest.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I can remember when you introduced a Bill and you didn't stay here for the debate.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I was referring to you, not to the Minister of Agriculture, who is absent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I know who you were having a shot at.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: At least he left the Minister of Lands here yesterday when he was absent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If you throw bricks you will get bricks back.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Perhaps I can continue. In 1950-51, for No. 1 grade barley, the net return to the grower was 104.57c a bushel; in 1951-52 it went up to 143.33c a bushel. (I am taking only selected years.) In 1962-63 it came back to 90.63c a bushel; in 1965-66 it was 101.23c a bushel; and for the year 1968-69, No. 30 pool, it was 101.32c a bushel. So that, whilst the realizations have been reasonable, there has been a tendency for them to fall, which has had a tightening effect on the finances of the farmer. Yesterday, the Chairman of the Australian Barley Board announced the final advance on No. 30 pool for the 1968-69 season, and that will be very acceptable indeed.

I have not dealt with what has happened regarding the wool situation, but it is an anxiety to us all to know that the wool position has declined to the extent it has declined; apparently, there is no great hope of the position being improved in the future. In this connection, I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Kemp on the contributions he made to this debate yesterday in dealing with these matters and I was delighted to see that he received such good press publicity, because his speech contained much valuable information and it was good to know that it has been placed on record and that it will be appreciated by the people. The reason for all my remarks is to show that I think it is necessary that those of us who are in Parliament and who have a practical appreciation of the problems confronting primary producers should do all we can to see that their problems are solved. I am more than sorry that the Hall Government was not returned, because new succession duties to be imposed by the present Government would not then be imposed.

I was in the country last weekend. I found that when primary producers are suffering a diminution in their incomes it is difficult for them to understand the recent announcement that an extra \$6,000,000 will be added to the State Budget as a result of extra service payments. Primary producers consider that enough preference has been given to a section of the community in this way, that their costs have been built up and that they are not getting quite the acknowledgment they should have. These matters will be much to the fore in our thinking when we are considering proposed legislation that will undoubtedly cause increases in costs to the State. If I have assessed the position correctly, the election we have just survived was precipitated because of a difference in opinion in another place as to what

should be done about the future water resources of this State and their development. The Hall Government took the view that it could not push on with Chowilla at present and that we should agree to immediate progress on Dartmouth. The Labor Opposition, as it then was, took the view, I think, that we should renegotiate the Dartmouth agreement to provide that Chowilla could go ahead simultaneously.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We never said that.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I used the word "think".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We never said that.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not want to mislead honourable members if the then Opposition's attitude was that it wanted to protect the situation regarding Chowilla. If that is so, I correct my statement. The present Government is on the Treasury benches largely because it adopted the attitude that the Chowilla agreement could be renegotiated.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Hall Government was on the benches before because it said it would build Chowilla. It said: "We will build Chowilla."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That happens to be political history.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Therefore, your Government is out: it did not honour its promise.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If that is so, I accept that situation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your Government said that it would build Chowilla.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Hall Government is out because it did not honour its promise, if we accept that as a true statement. The situation at present is that the new Government is in on the promise and undertaking to the people that it will renegotiate the Chowilla agreement. I am waiting for this renegotiation to happen.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You won't have to wait long.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I hope not. If this matter is not renegotiated satisfactorily then this Government, as far as talking about a mandate from the people is concerned, has had the ground cut from under its feet. This was the major issue in the election.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's not so. It was a main issue in some districts, but not in all districts.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I accept that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It was the principal issue in the election.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; it was the issue that caused the election.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, and it was an important issue in the minds of many people in many districts.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would the Labor Party think that we were being obstructive if we introduced the same amendment into the legislation here when the Bill comes through?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: We may have an opportunity to see.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your Party never had the numbers at any time to govern.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: All I am saying is that this was one of the main issues of the election and was an important issue in some districts and, to me, it is still a very important issue in assessing whether this Government still enjoys the people's confidence.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We will prove that to you.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I hope that the Government will be successful in its renegotiation. There is much talk at present about the Government having a mandate to do various things. One of the mandates it had was to renegotiate this agreement, and I am looking forward—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It may be closer than you anticipate.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I should like to know when it happens. I commenced my speech by saying that when there is a new Government there is a change in emphasis, and the change in emphasis is very marked with the Government we have today. The Governor's Deputy's Speech mentioned such things as establishing and operating pre-school kindergartens at all Aboriginal schools; additional moneys for the staff necessary to carry out the work of town and regional planning; the Hackney redevelopment programme; the engagement of Social Technology Systems Incorporated of Newton, Massachusetts, to undertake a preliminary study of work involved in the revision of the M.A.T.S. proposals; the establishment of a State film unit and film studio; legislation to bring to the notice of all persons the harmful effects of dangerous drugs; voting at 18 years; and laws relating to raffles and charitable lotteries. The Speech also mentioned that the law relating to lotteries would be revised.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That Bill has already been introduced.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am indebted to the Chief Secretary for that information. There is to be adult suffrage for the Legislative Council

and, if the Government has its way (which remains to be seen), four weeks annual leave for salaried officers of the Public Service. Some of these things may be desirable but some are a retrograde step; in total they will not add much value to the economy of the State. They will not provide more jobs for more people or look after the rising generations who want an opportunity to exercise their skill and ability.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Surely better education will assist rising generations.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I did not mention education.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Kindergartens are education.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: These things in themselves will not attract more industries to the State and they will not result in an expansion of our economy. It is a different emphasis from the emphasis given by the Playford Government and, to a large degree, the emphasis given by the Hall Government. Their philosophy was applied on the fundamental basis: to give the greatest opportunity to the greatest number of people, to encourage the State's resources in every way, keep costs and taxation to a minimum, keep the State's finances on a firm basis, and establish confidence in the investing public in realizing that South Australia is a place where they can invest their money with certainty that the results will be satisfactory. The justification for that kind of philosophy of working not in competition with private enterprise but in co-operation with it is the tremendous growth in the economy of this State during the Playford regime. One only has to think of the development of irrigation areas, forestry in the South-East, Leigh Creek coal, the Whyalla steel mills, the broadening of the railway gauge to Naracoorte and Mount Gambier, the establishment of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and the single wire earth return service—all these things advertised to the world that we were a progressive State that encouraged industry and that there was opportunity for young people. During that period there was an unprecedented expansion in our economy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Some of your people do not think that the Playford image is a good image today.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Whatever they may think, I am not outspoken against him and I pay him my respects for what he did for the State. As the years go by this State is beginning to appreciate the fruits of the policies he implemented. The new Government has changed the emphasis, which will no

longer be on the expansion of the economy, the attraction of industries and the development of opportunities—rather, it will be along social lines. The Labor Party has a different view from the view I have, but I believe that the view I have held for many years is correct—and it will prove to be correct very much sooner than many Government members at present realize. This will be recorded in the ballot box soon.

I pay a tribute to Sir Geoffrey Reed for the work he did as President of the Asthma Foundation of South Australia for many years. Upon his relinquishing the position, I was approached to accept that office. I am pleased to say that the foundation has undertaken a course of research that I hope some day will bring results to those unfortunate people who suffer from this disability that is spreading in our community. There was a public appeal that raised a large sum, and I am satisfied that it has been applied in the best possible way to achieve excellent results. I should like to mention the asthma weather spora survey that we are conducting throughout South Australia. The purpose of the survey is to relate the incidence of asthma to the incidence of spora in the air. The information gained will be collated on a computer, and we are hoping to arrive at some worthwhile results. The following memorandum on this matter has been issued:

The asthma weather spora survey is progressing very satisfactorily. The first year's record of patient data has been produced in graphical form by our computer and is proving of great interest to our medical officers. It is expected that the spora data for the same period will be available shortly and the weather data is readily available. Considerable more data is required before any attempt is made to correlate the various parameters but, in the meantime, a computer programme is being prepared to have a look at the "time-lag" relationship between hay fever and asthma.

The foundation has allocated the sum of \$2,500 for an investigation into the housedust mite's contribution to asthma. It is intended to employ a technical assistant to obtain housedust from eight houses in the metropolitan area on a once-weekly basis. Waite institute has offered to provide the necessary facilities and laboratory space for analysis of the samples.

We are therefore trying to relate what is in the atmosphere to the incidence of asthma and by this means we hope to find a solution. What is known as the housedust mite, which exists in most houses, appears to have a bearing on the incidence of asthma. We are keenly working on this matter at present. In addition, we are financing an

oversea trip by Dr. John H. Alpers, who is at present at the University of Colorado medical centre. He has recently supplied the following report on his work:

- (1) February through May 31, 1970—  
Division of clinical immunology, University of Colorado medical centre, experience at the Colorado General Hospital Allergy Clinic, consultant, and investigation of patients with immunologic diseases on the wards will be the area of training received for this period. In addition, further laboratory experience in the field of immunoglobulins, complement studies, and the investigation of an *in vitro* tests for drug allergies.
- (2) June 1 through October 15, 1970—  
Training and experience at the National Jewish Hospital in pediatrics and adult sections in the investigation of patients with severe asthma.
- (3) October 16 through November 30, 1970—  
This period is to be spent at the Colorado General Hospital under Dr. Ernie Cotton in pediatric intensive care for respiratory diseases.
- (4) December 1 through January 1, 1971—  
To be spent at Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital to observe directly the long-term care of several asthmatic children. In particular, additional training in the psychological aspects of the disease.
- (5) January 1 through March 31, 1971—  
To be spent as a fellow in the respiratory intensive care service at Colorado General Hospital under the direction of Dr. Tom Petty. Direct patient care and management will be part of this training.

That very comprehensive programme justifies the expenditure of the money raised in the appeal, and I sincerely hope it will bring satisfactory results. The foundation in South Australia has conducted swimming classes for asthmatic children. The next swimming classes will be held at the Burnside swimming centre on August 1. Any children who would like to enrol are asked to contact the foundation. I should like this matter to be given publicity. Also, we have over the last year received invitations on occasions from various bodies

in various parts of the State (school welfare clubs and so on) asking that a speaker be provided to tell them of the work of the foundation, and where it has been possible we have provided in most instances a medical practitioner to go to this area and give an address on the problems of asthma.

As president of the foundation, I want to say that if there are other bodies throughout the State who feel that this is a matter in which they are interested we would be pleased to make available a speaker who would be competent to address them on what the foundation is doing and on what it hopes to achieve. Of course, he would not address them exactly on the medical aspects of the complaint, because that is a matter which must be dealt with between themselves and their own doctor.

As we are getting to the stage where we are using a good deal of the money that was raised at the previous appeal, we may need to go to the public for another appeal in due course. Asthma is a condition one has to experience before one realizes just exactly what it means to the sufferer. I believe that already we are achieving some results, and I commend the appeal to the community generally.

Recently, the foundation sent out letters to people who had been members of the foundation but who had not, for one reason or another, renewed their membership. I am more than delighted to say that the response we got was very good indeed; many people have joined again and in fact many have paid a fee to become life members of the foundation. As I have said, this is something which is quite free from politics and something in which I think the community at large has a very great interest.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 28, at 2.15 p.m.