

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

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

### QUESTIONS

#### ASSESSMENT OF DAMAGES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the *Advertiser* of Saturday, November 19, 1966, the Attorney-General, now the Premier, commented on the action this Council took in relation to the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill. Among other things, he said:

One measure in the Supreme Court Bill was an urgent reform providing for an interim assessment of damages. The Council's action hurt people who need this relief.

As honourable members know, this Council wanted to assess the merits of this legislation and so it deferred consideration of it until February, when the Government itself introduced three and a half pages of amendments to the Bill. Will the Minister of Local Government ascertain from the Attorney-General how many declaratory judgments have been made by the Supreme Court since the proclamation of the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill, which was passed last session?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

#### UNDERGROUND WATER

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: About September, 1966, this Council dealt with amendments to the Underground Waters Preservation Act that empowered the committee set up by the legislation to place restrictions on boring and, in particular, on areas in which bores might be put down. I understand that at present a restriction is also placed on the quantity of water that can be pumped from bores. Can the Minister say whether this is correct and, if it is, on what basis the restriction is placed?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As honourable members know, under the amendments an Advisory Committee and an Appeal Board

were set up. On the advice of the Advisory Committee some applications for new bores have been rejected; subsequently the applicant has appealed to the board which, in some cases, has granted permission for a bore to be put down below the prescribed depth but has restricted the quantity of water that can be used. In other words, the applicant has said to that board that he wants X-thousand gallons a day and the board, after fully considering the matter, has decided that the quantity should be somewhat less than that asked for and has consequently granted the appeal, but on a restricted basis. These are the only occasions on which restrictions have been imposed, and they have been imposed not by me but by the Appeal Board. In practice, the legislation gives the Appeal Board more power than it gives the Minister or anybody else, although I do not think that was the original intention. This basin is becoming so depleted that serious consideration is now being given to requesting more or less general restrictions on the amount of water that can be used daily, having in mind the actual needs of each individual grower. The position regarding this basin is rather precarious, and unless it is replenished rather quickly nobody in the area will have any water, because the sea will be coming in and swamping the basin out altogether.

#### ALICE SPRINGS ROAD

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Roads regarding the installation of ramps on the Coober Pedy to Pimba Road, and the Minister pointed out that although his department had taken over the control of the plant and the roads in that area it apparently had not taken over the commitments of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry take up this matter with the Minister of Works and ascertain for me the intention of the E. & W. S. Department to meet its obligations under the agreement entered into with the station owners along that road?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will place the honourable member's request before my colleague and bring back a report as soon as it is available.

## INDUSTRIES PROMOTION

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Minister representing the Premier an answer to my recent question in connection with the personnel of the Industries Promotion and Research Section of the Premier's Department?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This question was asked previously of the honourable the Chief Secretary. The replies are as follows:

1. There are two university-qualified economists at present on the staff of the Industries Promotion and Research Section of the Premier's Department.
2. There are two university-qualified engineers on the staff of the Industries Assistance Branch. In addition, a third officer has a diploma in mechanical engineering.
3. Two officers of the Industries Assistance Branch are qualified draftsmen.

## GOODWOOD ROAD

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The wide section of Goodwood Road between Colonel Light Gardens and Daw Park is at present being remade, and it would appear that this work is to stop at a point about opposite the Repatriation Hospital. Obviously, some extension of this southern highway will be necessary ultimately through to the main South Road, and also possibly a further extension is contemplated to run up into the Blackwood and Eden Hills area. Will the Minister indicate whether such plans are finalized? If they are, can he disclose the position of such an extension or extensions and say when his department intends to carry out this work?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This section of the road has been considered. There are plans to widen Goodwood Road between Daws Road and the intersection that will occur with South Road at Tonsley. The Highways Department plans to widen this road so that it will be able to cope with the volume of traffic using it, but the continuation of this work will depend on the availability of funds. This work is planned to be done. The planning in respect of the other road mentioned by the honourable member (to join up with Shepherds Hill Road) I shall have to refer to the department, to get a report for the honourable

member. I will let the honourable member know the answer as soon as possible.

## PORT AUGUSTA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: On July 25 tenders for the proposed construction of the Port Augusta Technical College closed. When they were called, the Port Augusta contractors were told they need not bother to submit a quotation as it would not be considered. My source of information is the leading article of the *Transcontinental* of July 20. Can the Minister ascertain from his colleague why this attitude was adopted, since local contractors successfully constructed the local post office, police station, Government offices, Carlton Primary School and Commonwealth Railways Institute recently? To my knowledge and to the knowledge of everyone else they did a good job. The local contractors want to know why they were denied the right to tender for this business.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The remarks of the honourable member surprise me. I think they surprise himself. I do not know that this has occurred previously but, if it has, I do not know the details of it. However, I will get a report on the matter from the Minister of Works and bring it back for the honourable member as soon as possible.

## GREENHILL ROAD

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Last session the Minister of Roads promised that a safety fence would be extended along a dangerous section of the Greenhill Road as money became available. It is apparent that no money has become available. Will the Minister ensure that sufficient funds are provided in the 1967-68 Estimates for this work to be completed?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As I understand that it is necessary that some investigation be made into this matter, I shall have it examined and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Roads) moved:

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

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I realize it is somewhat unusual for a member to speak on the third reading of a Bill. I had hoped that representatives of the large motorists' organization would make themselves heard, or possibly even made themselves seen, in the galleries of this Chamber during the second reading and Committee debates. I am not unmindful of the frequent claims made by that very large organization in this State that it looks after the motorists' interests, particularly in regard to roads. It would seem, therefore, that I shall have to seek some other means of giving publicity to this matter, instead of depending on that avenue. Therefore, I trust that even rising at this stage in the debate will give some opportunity to nearly 500,000 motorists in this State to realize what is being done with their registration fees. There is no need for me to go into the details, as I have already elaborated on them on two occasions. I can only again express my deep hostility to this wretched breach of an arrangement.

The Council divided on the third reading:

Ayes (12).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan (teller), Jessie Cooper, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, A. F. Kneebone, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, and V. G. Springett.

Noes (5).—The Hons. G. J. Gilfillan, Sir Norman Jude (teller), H. K. Kemp, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Pair.—Aye—The Hon. A. J. Shard. No—The Hon. M. B. Dawkins.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE  
COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 1. Page 924.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): We have had the advantage of a second reading explanation of this Bill in which I think a little too much emphasis was placed on one or

two aspects without dealing with it as fully as we might have hoped. We had the further advantage yesterday of an excellent second reading speech by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. DeGaris), and I thought he covered the subject extremely well. I believe he made it easier for those of us desiring to speak on the Bill. I do not wish to traverse in detail the matters covered by him.

The Bill requires careful consideration. I have looked at it from all angles and tried to assess whether it will add anything to the value of the State. I have come to the conclusion that it would be better not to place such a Bill on the Statute Book. I cannot see any necessity for it, nor that it will achieve the purpose its sponsors have said it will achieve. I can see that some unfortunate repercussions from it will adversely affect this State at a time when we should be trying to attract industry and trying to convince people that if they come to South Australia they will be welcomed. We should not be indicating to them that if they do come to this State and make a success of their enterprise the Government may set up in opposition to them.

My first reason for opposing the Bill is that I believe it discloses a misunderstanding of the responsibility belonging to the Government. I emphasize the difference between the responsibility a Government should carry in looking towards the future development of the State and the responsibility it has in handling everyday affairs. If I may venture a criticism (and it is a criticism that applies to Governments all around the world: if one looks at the position in Great Britain one can see it applies there) it is that the Government is so bogged down with trivialities and minor matters cropping up from day to day that it has completely lost a sense of responsibility in setting a course for the future development of the State.

The members of Cabinet are the directors of a company called South Australia, and the responsibility of those directors should concern future development, future expansion, and future progress. Their responsibility is to set the course which the State will follow and they should be sitting back and asking the questions: where are we going, where will be in five years' time, what is our objective for the next ten years of development in South Australia, and what are our long-term projects? In addition, they should be asking themselves: what are we doing to set private enterprise on a proper course of continuing development for South Australia?

The policy followed by the previous L.C.L. Government always had some vision, always had a plan, and always had a course of development in mind. After the war it was realized that there would be some economic development.

We realized that there would have to be a place where people could live and where development could occur, so we planned the city of Elizabeth, and everybody knows what a tremendous advantage to this State that city has been. We realized that there were people who would need to settle on the land and we realized the need to develop land that was capable of development, and so we went into the question of the development of irrigation areas along the Murray River and the development of Kangaroo Island and other parts of the State. We realized that there had to be power and water, and so we set about the development of Leigh Creek and the establishment of the Electricity Trust. Consequently, very much of the credit that the present Government is now claiming for South Australia's progress is due not to its efforts but to the strong and good foundations laid by the Playford Government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Wasn't the establishment of the Electricity Trust a socialistic move?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: It may have been, but the establishment of the Electricity Trust is very different from the establishment of a Government Insurance Office. However, I do not want to be diverted from the point I am trying to make: it is not the responsibility of Cabinet to be bogged down with these petty matters—its responsibility is to determine the course of South Australia's future development, and as far as I can see there are no long-term plans and there is no set course. We are merely battling on from day to day trying to patch up problems that are largely of the present Government's own making.

Let us look at the kinds of problem that have concerned this Government over the past few months. We find that when a school-teacher breaks some minor regulation of the Education Act (a breach that most Ministers could have dealt with before breakfast) before we know where we are we are bogged down in a Royal Commission and the expenditure of thousands of dollars, and after all this the Minister says, "I can fix this up myself, anyway."

Time has been wasted on trivialities. One of the Ministers in this Council is responsible for the overall development of health services

in South Australia, but he tells us he is using his time to inspect sites for Totalizator Agency Board shops. We have a Premier who has the tremendous responsibility of the office of Treasurer (I would not like this responsibility at this time of trying to find money from various sources to achieve what has been described as a balanced Budget) and we find that he spends part of his time trying to advertise himself as some sort of sex symbol. I do not think these are the kinds of topic that should be the responsibility of Cabinet.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I don't think you could accuse him of trying to advertise himself. Don't tell me the papers help the Government!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not think they do, but I think they are trying to do their best. The Government is bogged down in these minor matters when the things that should be attracting its attention and which people look to a Cabinet to control have gone right over its head, and the Government is muddling along from day to day without knowing the complete answer.

I believe this Bill falls into that category. If anything, there are too many insurance companies now. In my opinion the insurance field has become too competitive and I am not satisfied that all those in the field at present will find it sufficiently lucrative to remain there over the long period that is required of an insurance company. We must remember that some insurance contracts last for many years; I hope the life assurance contracts on my own life will continue for a good many years. Be that as it may, insurance firms need to be of extraordinary financial stability, certainly of much greater financial stability than that which this Government exhibits at present.

The insurance field is extremely competitive and, if members of the Government do not believe this, they should tell two firms that they want to insure their lives, and they will be deluged with propositions. When the field is so competitive and when it is comprised of firms that are experts, I cannot see where the Government finds responsibility to come into this field at all.

I would be foolish if I said that no criticism of insurance companies was warranted; there is criticism of them, and there is criticism of Parliament, of members of Parliament, of the legal profession and of the medical profession. However, I am not one to suggest that these criticisms will be overcome by socializing the legal profession, the medical profession or

the insurance profession, because by virtue of the very nature of these professions there are two sides to be considered in any problem connected with them.

The man who is a barrister and appears in court cannot reasonably expect to win more than 50 per cent of the cases in which he is engaged; this means that 50 per cent of his clients will be dissatisfied because he has failed to get the verdict he sought. The doctor cannot hope to be successful in all his operations, and so he has some dissatisfied patients. In the insurance field there are conflicting interests; the man who has insured his property wants to get as much as he can from his insurance company, and so there must be an interplay between the claimant and the company on which the claim is made. This leads to a difference of interest and a difference of opinion and a certain amount of dissatisfaction, and I do not see that this will be remedied by bringing a Government Insurance Office into the field.

Many people have a misunderstanding of the principles of insurance. Take the ordinary case of a farmer who insures his crop of wheat or barley. Perhaps he does not insure it for its full value; perhaps he insures it for about 20 bushels to the acre, whereas in fact it may return 30 bushels to the acre. If hail or fire damage occurs, the farmer becomes disappointed when he finds he must bear portion of the loss; he has overlooked the principle involved that if he insures for only two-thirds of the value of the crop he is entitled to claim only two-thirds of the value of the damage suffered. I have heard of cases where the insured did not understand this principle.

I suppose that workmen's compensation is the most fruitful source of dissatisfaction because it is very difficult to determine whether an injury has been incurred as a result of something done at a man's work or as a result of some other cause. I suppose the best example is of the man who does heavy work during the day and goes home and suffers a heart attack, which may or may not be fatal, but which certainly disables him. The question arises whether this attack is something that would have happened to him in any event or something that resulted from his work. There is room for argument here, and this will be so whether the firm concerned is the Government Insurance Office or a private insurance office. So, by virtue of the very nature of the insurance business, there will always be room for criticism and dissatisfaction, and I am not satisfied that a Government

Insurance Office will get over these criticisms any better than a private insurance office will. I think the proof of this is that in the other States that have Government Insurance Offices there is just as much criticism (in fact, more) regarding some angles of insurance as there is in South Australia, where we have only the competitive private insurance companies.

When this Government Insurance Office commences, it will have a ready-made field of business available to it. The answer given by the Chief Secretary, I think to a question by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, was that the total insurance cover effected against fire by the South Australian Government in respect of buildings and plant was for about \$58,000,000, whereas the actual value of the buildings on a replacement basis would be about \$248,000,000. I take it that that risk would be immediately available as a commencement of business for the Government Insurance Office, as would also its workmen's compensation insurance, which it carries itself at present, and certain third party bodily injury policies.

If the new office is going to undertake business of that magnitude, it will involve a large amount of finance by the Government; or, alternatively, it will mean that the new Government Insurance Office must enter into reciprocal arrangements with the ordinary tariff companies to enable it to offset some of the risk. I do not know what the attitude of the private tariff companies would be in those circumstances, but I should think it would be rather optimistic on the part of the Government to hope to be able to go along to these private companies and ask for help in spreading the risk. It would be like saying to those companies, "We will set up in opposition to you; we have certain preferences in getting business that you don't enjoy, because we enjoy certain exemptions from liability that you do not; we will undercut you regarding certain rates, but we want you to come to the party with us in connection with this laying off of claims."

I do not see how a Government Insurance Office that sets itself up in unfair competition with the ordinary tariff companies can at the same time expect reciprocal arrangements with the tariff companies regarding the settlement of claims. At the same time, I do not see how a State office could operate unless it had that reciprocal arrangement with private companies. If it did operate without that arrangement, it would be liable to land the Treasury with exceedingly large claims in the

event of our having a severe fire or severe flood or other unexpected calamity in South Australia.

This, I think, adds point to the refusal of the Premier and other Ministers of this Government to give us any idea what the cost of establishing this insurance office will be. I think they ought to tell us in general terms what they think the cost will be, and they ought to tell us whether the Government intends to make reciprocal arrangements with other insurance companies. I think we are entitled to know that. If the Government cannot make these other arrangements, then I think it would be putting an undue burden on the taxpayer of South Australia in the event of there being a rather severe loss.

One clause of the Bill purports to provide that this office will operate in fair competition with the private companies, and that it will have to pay the same rates and taxes as the private companies have to pay. However, I am not at all satisfied that that will be the position. For instance, there are such things as State land tax, motor registration fees, water rates, Commonwealth taxes, such as sales tax and payroll tax, and so on. Also, there is the question of council rates. If this insurance office is a Government instrumentality it will not be involved in council rates. Also, it possibly could have its printing done by the Government Printer. It could get certain legal services from the Crown Law Office, and so on, and in many other ways it would enjoy a preference that the private insurance companies would not enjoy.

Therefore, I am not satisfied that the clause that purports to provide that the office will operate on a competitive basis will achieve that result. I think that, no matter what is written into the Bill, we will be setting up an insurance office that will have some preference over the ordinary private insurance company. Years ago the Labor Government in Queensland set up a State insurance office, and this has operated reasonably successfully. However, it is interesting to note that the establishment of that office was followed by a Socialist Government's establishing State butcher shops, fisheries, canneries, produce agencies, hotels, cold stores and mining interests. What is to follow the introduction of this Bill in South Australia, I do not know, but these things were established in Queensland and, so far as I know, most of them have turned out to be complete failures.

Many of the insurance companies operating today are finding that their profit margins are being very considerably reduced and they are living today and making a success of it only because of the profits they have accumulated over the years. If they had to depend on the profits they are making at present they would find that they would have difficulty in doing so. I think that that will be the experience if this office is established in South Australia, for I believe that the venture into this field is being made at a very late hour, and that it will be a long time before the office will adequately pay its way and before it will get to the basis where it will have any reserves that can be applied for the benefit of South Australia.

The argument has been used that once this company gets on its feet it will provide a certain amount of revenue to the Treasury. If that is to be the argument used, it could apply to things other than insurance, as the Government in Queensland tried to apply it there by going into other forms of business. If this Bill is serving on the people in private industry in South Australia notice that the Government intends to go ahead with its policy of the socialization of industry and exchange and so on, I think it is driving industry away from this State rather than indicating to people outside the State that this is a place that attracts industry.

Because I firmly believe that the Bill will not achieve the object that it sets out to achieve, that is, to remove criticism from the field of insurance; because I believe it will be a very long time indeed, if ever, before it adds to the Treasury funds in South Australia; because I believe that the field is adequately covered with efficient companies at present; and because I believe that we should be indicating that we have confidence in private industry instead of saying that we want to run into competition with it at this point of time, I must oppose the Bill.

It has been said that the Government has a mandate from the people of South Australia to introduce this legislation. I read very carefully the statement made on this matter in the policy speech given by the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) prior to the last election, but the best I can say for the statement that appeared in the policy speech is that it was garbled. In fact, it is difficult to read into it just exactly what the Labor Party meant. But in any event, even if the Government had a mandate to do this at the last

election, if it went to the people tomorrow (and I invite it to do so) it would find that its mandate had been revoked.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Somebody has forgotten the Labor vote in Corio.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have not forgotten it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was only last November that you got your mandate. You have to go to Victoria for that.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I agree: we have to go to Victoria before we can find any support for the Labor Party. We shall not find it nearer home. I am not alleging that this Bill has not some popular appeal. People who have had an unfortunate experience with regard to an insurance claim may in some way think that this is an answer to their problem, but I am satisfied that it is not; that a Government Insurance Office will not give greater satisfaction to the people than private enterprise does. That is my experience. I find that inevitably when I am dealing with a private firm I get much more satisfaction and quicker attention than if I am dealing with a Government-controlled enterprise. Most of us know that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I have found it difficult to get third party insurance.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have never had any problem about third party insurance.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I referred the matter to the honourable member when he was Attorney-General.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No doubt it would have been fixed up.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He must have referred it to his offsider.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have forgotten the incident. This is not the kind of legislation we want on the South Australian Statute Book. There are many more important and far-reaching matters that should be occupying the attention of Cabinet with regard to the future development, welfare and expansion of this State. However, I realize that this is Socialist philosophy. Private enterprise philosophy is that we are looking ahead all the time, trying to expand the economy and create more jobs for more people and to ensure that the thousands upon thousands of children leaving school each year will have an expanded economy in which to exercise their talents and abilities. That is how democracy progresses and how the private enterprise countries of the world have developed.

We turn from that to the introspective and backward-looking views of a Socialist Government. It is not interested in the future development of the country: it is interested in a different approach. It says, "Somebody seems to have a lucrative business. I think we will try that as well and see whether we can do better." This is not the only instance we have had of the Labor Party in South Australia trying to upset a satisfactory business. I remember some years ago when we were trying to get the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to establish a steelworks in South Australia. Sir Thomas Playford was doing his best to bring this about. Fortunately, he succeeded in spite of the fact that the Labor Party did its best to torpedo his efforts. When we were trying to encourage the B.H.P. to undertake this work, the Labor Party in another place moved a motion compulsorily to acquire the assets of the B.H.P. in South Australia. That attack by the Australian Labor Party of that time on private enterprise in this State is still in the minds of the people and is still affecting the development of this State.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Some of those people are Ministers now.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes. This is not the kind of approach we should have to this problem. It is annoying to think that Sir Thomas Playford, who did all that good work for the establishment of industry in this State, has been followed by a Premier who is continually doing his best to knock the State at every point and turn. He gets to his feet and talks about frightening off private enterprise by introducing a Government Insurance Office into the field; he talks about prosecuting 30 companies for alleged offences, which did not occur; he talks about town planning, and all he has done is to get an Act on the Statute Book; but when it comes to really doing anything about it he appears on television and says, "The Commonwealth won't give me any money so I can't do anything about it." This all-talk department has been established in the Premier's office. It issues magnanimous statements which are all hot air and are not followed by real action. That is knocking South Australia. The people of this State will not allow this to continue much longer. The Government cannot in the long run get away with a lot of talk. It can spend money on publicity and public relations officers, it can surround itself with hordes of these people and dish out information to morning and afternoon papers but, after all is said and done, actions speak louder than words. We

have had a surfeit of words, promises of new industries and threats of being on the threshold of new developments—but nothing happens. This kind of thing is bogging down the whole of Cabinet, affecting its handling of day-to-day problems. It is constantly trying to plug up the financial holes that appear in the Treasury almost every day. What a thrilling experience it must be to be a member of Cabinet at present: to look at the Cabinet notice paper and see that the first item is "Finance, shortage of".

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The honourable member has a wonderful imagination; he always did have.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: So today we take some money out of the trust funds and fix that up. Then next week we look at the notice paper again and see that the first item is still "Finance, shortage of". We think, "This must be last week's." But no—it has happened again!

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: No; it is left over from the Playford Government.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Then the following week we again look at the Cabinet notice paper and see, still as the first item, "Finance, shortage of". Cabinet then decides to introduce the Morphett Street Bridge Bill. This is not the kind of development we want in South Australia. We should be looking to future development. I sincerely hope that we have come to the end of the stage of an all-talk department under the Premier and that we have reached the stage of real action, because the people of South Australia have lost confidence. The people of Para Hills who have seen the values of their properties decrease are not concerned about insurance: they are concerned about retaining or regaining the values of their properties.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They are clearing off to Western Australia for work.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Of course they are. I hope that the Government will get out of this habit of knocking South Australia. Perhaps it is being done unconsciously and unwittingly but, nonetheless, it is being done. We want an Administration that people can have confidence in, so that we can show other parts of Australia that we are not a backward-looking, introspective Socialist Government about to split the piece of cake that we have into two. We must get on with the programme of development and expansion and show, by work and not by broadcasts on tape around the world, what we intend to do, and by some practical activity that we welcome and encour-

age industry to establish here; that our attitude towards private enterprise and development is not one of competition, opposition or dissatisfaction but one of mutual co-operation, understanding and development; that we are running along in double harness, each contributing his share and each adding to the total sum of the welfare of the people of South Australia. I have a different political philosophy from that of the members of the Government. They are entitled to their political philosophy, but I should think they would have lived with it long enough to see the fallacy of it. This Bill will be defeated.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You made that quite obvious. That was published in the paper last week.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: In adopting this attitude we are not doing anything derogatory to the interests of the people of South Australia; we are not depriving any of the people of South Australia of the satisfaction to which they are entitled.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your Leader said that we had a mandate. Now you are saying you will defeat the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was a tenuous mandate.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Leader is brighter than I am.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's why he is the Leader.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I agree. I could not understand what was meant in the policy speech in the clause dealing with insurance. It was not clear to me. I do not know whether it meant that it gave the Government a right to introduce a Bill to cover all forms of insurance or only a limited form of insurance. I do not know whether it gave the Government the right to introduce any insurance Bill. If in some way the Government considered that it had a mandate when the last elections were held, it does not have it today. If the Government wishes to prove me wrong, let it go to the elections again.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You were proved wrong when you said we would last for only 30 days.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Government members cannot logically argue that, because the Government happened to be returned at the last election, the majority of the people of the State endorsed everything in the policy speech. If that is so, the people endorsed the part of the policy speech that said the Government believed in accurate budgeting. In view



of what has happened in relation to the Budget, I think the Government members must be having problems with their conscience. I have been diverted from what I had intended to say by the interjections, but I have not been diverted from my original views in opposition to the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you mean diverted, or converted?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have been neither diverted, nor converted. This Bill will not add anything to the satisfaction that people hope to get from insurance. On the other hand, if a Government Insurance Office is established in South Australia the complaints that will be lodged against it will be far greater in number and far more serious than the complaints that have been lodged against private enterprise insurance.

I have invariably found from experience over a good many years that if I have had a complaint about a business transaction against a private firm, it has generally been only too anxious to meet me and try to settle the matter, whereas complaints against a Government instrumentality are generally much more difficult to get straightened out. This has been the experience in the other States. It is not as though criticism of insurance is limited to South Australia, where there is no Government Insurance Office. From press cuttings I have in front of me and from information I have been given, I am inclined to think that the criticism of insurance and the dissatisfaction is greater in other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, than it is in South Australia. I do not think the Government can show that people anywhere are more satisfied with a Government Insurance Office than they are with private insurance companies. None of us is perfect: we are all human beings and have our own shortcomings and feelings and an inherent difficulty in appreciating to the full the other person's point of view. Those things are evident when an insurance claim is being settled. The person who has an insurance claim is incapable of seeing that he is to a degree partly at fault in a motor accident. Sometimes we cannot see the wood for the trees; consequently, we cannot hope to get an insurance company or to build a complete set of insurance laws to give complete satisfaction to people all the time.

There will always be criticism, and the Government Insurance Office will do nothing to lessen the complaints. I am opposed to the Bill not because it is a Government Bill

but because I do not think it will achieve the objects it sets out to achieve, even though it may have been brought forward by the Government with all the sincerity in the world. If the Government is interested in the long-term reaction, it will drop this Bill because, although it might give some momentary satisfaction to people who have had unsatisfactory experiences with insurance companies, in the long-term it will rebound on the Government, and people who have insured with the Government Insurance Office will revert to private enterprise insurance.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Why is there so much opposition from private enterprise and the insurance companies to this legislation when you are leading us to believe that this is such a bad field to enter that the Government should keep well out of it?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think the opposition from private insurance companies is because they consider that they are giving satisfactory service to the community and that this Bill will not add anything to the benefits to be obtained by the people insured.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They have nothing to fear if they are giving satisfaction.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: No matter what field one is engaged in, one does not like to see a competitor enter the field. The Government does not like to think that it will not be here next year but that someone else will be. Nobody wants to see a Government entering a field that belongs to private enterprise. I believe that the greatest satisfaction to the individual, the quickest development of the economy and the greatest advancement of the State can be made under a private enterprise economy. If we are going to demonstrate to private enterprise that we are going to challenge it and establish in opposition with it on unfair terms, it will damage the economy. I can understand the attitude of the insurance companies on this matter. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 1. Page 924.)

New clause 3a—"Qualifications of aldermen and councillors."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I move to insert the following new clause:

3a. Paragraph (d1) of subsection (3) of section 52 of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by inserting after the word "his" therein the words "or his wife's";
- (b) by inserting after the passage "(h)" therein the words and symbols "or (h1)"; and
- (c) by inserting after the passage "(b2)" therein the words and symbols "or (b3)".

I explained the reason for this amendment during the second reading debate when I pointed out that it would also be necessary to amend section 52 of the principal Act if provision was to be made for the insurance of persons acting in the capacity of mayoress or the wife of a district council chairman.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): This matter was previously under discussion and it was realized that some clauses of the present Bill needed clarification. This appears to be one of them, and although we did not discuss section 52 previously this is a consequential amendment and I accept it.

New clause inserted.

Clause 4—"Minimum rate."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have several drafting amendments to this clause which I fully explained in the second reading debate. I now move:

To strike out all words after "ratable" and insert "properties within the meaning of subsection (2) of this section are".

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

To strike out "rate" first occurring and insert "amount payable by way of rates".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

In line 14 to strike out "the" last occurring, and insert "its".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

In line 16 to strike out "the" and insert "such", and to strike out "rate" and insert "amount".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Minimum rates."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

To strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; and to strike out all words after "ratable" down to and including "is" in line 20 and insert "properties within the meaning of subsections (2) or (3) of this section are".

Amendments carried.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

To strike out "rate" first occurring and insert "amount payable by way of rates".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:  
In line 22 to strike out "the" second occurring and insert "its".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

In line 23 to strike out "the" second occurring and insert "such".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

To strike out "rate" last occurring and insert "amount".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 8) and title passed. Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

### CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 1. Page 925.)

Clause 7—"Establishment of Cattle Compensation Fund."

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I move:

In subclause (3) (b) after "Act" to insert "not exceeding in the aggregate the amount of interest referred to in subsection (2) of this section".

I remind honourable members of my previous remarks. I agree that some money should be allowed from the Cattle Compensation Fund and made available to the department to pursue its campaign against bovine tuberculosis. However, I was not happy at first with the provision allowing the fund to be fully accessible for this purpose. I believe that my amendment will result in this legislation contributing handsomely toward the elimination of tuberculosis in cattle, and it will also preserve the fund so that it will be available in the event of the outbreak of some disease that calls for heavy compensation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I support the amendment and I commend the Hon. Mr. Whyte for bringing it forward. I am in sympathy with the principle involved whereby the interest can be used for the general improvement of the condition of our stock, but I am not in favour of using funds that have been put aside for a specific purpose for some other purpose, and that is precisely what is being proposed in this legislation as it is drawn at present.

The amendment makes available the whole of the interest that accrues to this fund. The Government has agreed to pay interest at a rate that was not disclosed but which I understand will bring into the fund for the

14-month period in which it has been functioning about \$13,000. One would estimate that it is in excess of \$10,000 a year and consequently it is available to the department for the purposes for which it requires this additional money. The fund was built up in the past but no interest was paid on it, and the Government provided out of general revenue the money to carry out the services which, it is proposed, will be paid for by the fund if this measure is passed without amendment.

The interest must come from somewhere, and therefore it must come from general revenue, so we are almost back where we started. When the Playford Government was in office it provided this money out of general revenue and got on with the job. I have no objection to the interest being utilized for the purposes stated, but I am bitterly opposed to interfering with any of these funds that have been put aside by many producers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And paid for by the producers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, and which were put there for a specific purpose. I point out to the Minister that no limitation is being put on the amount of the accrued interest that the Government may spend. The fund will continue to build up and so will the interest on it. Consequently, this will be a very handy nest egg for the Government in a fairly short time. I understand that at present there is \$13,000 available for immediate use and at the end of the financial year an additional amount of more than \$10,000 will be available, so the department will have up to \$25,000 with which to get on with its work. I ask the Government to take a long look at this amendment and not to become petulant because some other system may have been suggested from some other source. What I am saying has the backing of one of the largest growers' organizations, which passed a resolution, copies of which are in the hands of most honourable members. Growers have asked that Parliament protect these funds as a whole and that they should not be eroded.

I do not want to deny the Government one cent and I do not want to handicap it in its work, but it would be much better if it took any money it required (over and above the amount of interest which has accrued and will accrue) from general revenue in the short period, if necessary. If the Government continues to pay the interest at the present rate I doubt whether it will have to dip into general revenue for much money, but it is better for it to dip into general revenue, and thereby keep

the accounts clean and the funds intact, than for it to start eroding the funds and losing the producers' confidence.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): This amendment is definitely not acceptable to the Government. I have listened attentively to the comments of the previous speakers, and it appears to me that some organizations cannot make up their minds where they want to go. I understand that conferences have been held between the department and interested organizations and that it was stated that the fund was sufficient to meet the demands for compensation.

This fund was set up for the specific purpose of paying compensation to persons whose cattle were condemned because of disease and to people who lost cattle through the disease. This cannot be denied. This legislation is in the best interests of the industry and of the State. We have been asked how it will affect the farmers and the general population. Is it not better to stamp out something such as this than to wait for an epidemic to occur and then be faced with the wholesale payment of compensation?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think there is any possibility of an epidemic of bovine tuberculosis?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have heard comments about that, and so has the Leader. If an outbreak should occur, what would we do?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The statements were not made in relation to bovine tuberculosis.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If the position is that we have to hold the fund because of the possibility of an outbreak, how can we argue that such an outbreak is not possible? The fund has increased, and the balance as at June 30 was \$305,248. This includes the interest payment. I remind honourable members that despite all the alleged failings of the present Government, it was this Government that decided to pay interest on the fund; it was never done before, but it has been done by this Government. I understand that the honourable member who has now moved this amendment spoke to the Minister of Agriculture on the matter last night. I have been told by the Minister that he was under the impression that an agreement had been reached between the honourable member and the Minister in relation to restricting the payment in any one financial

year to \$25,000, with no strings attached. Yesterday, the honourable member put a condition of five years on it, but I understand that he agreed with the Minister of Agriculture last night to dispense with that and to accept the \$25,000 in any one financial year as the limitation of any expenditure for the purpose of increasing research into the cattle diseases provided for in the principal Act.

This was what the Minister of Agriculture told me before I came into this Chamber. The Minister went on to say that if that amendment was moved he could accept it. However, I was then informed that this had gone overboard so the honourable member has somersaulted and we are back to his original amendment. The Minister has told me that if this Chamber carries such an amendment he will not accept it and the Bill will have to go overboard. The honourable member is not going to adhere to the promise he made to the Minister so he is backsliding now. I am instructed by the Minister of Agriculture not to accept this amendment, for he will not accept it himself in any circumstances and the Bill will have to go out. If that is what honourable members want, the matter is in their hands.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Perhaps the Minister could tell honourable members of the increased amount to be spent on this campaign over what has been spent previously. It is my understanding that the total amount of money to be spent on this campaign will be about \$25,000 a year. Is this the total amount that will be spent on tuberculosis eradication, or is this in excess of what has been spent over the last many years in relation to this campaign?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I understand that an amount not exceeding \$25,000 is to be spent on eradication in any one financial year. I have no information before me regarding what has been spent in the past. I believe this is what was discussed last night between the Hon. Mr. Whyte and the Minister, and that was what the Minister was prepared to accept.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Much has been said about an arrangement between the Minister of Agriculture and a member of this Chamber, but that has nothing to do with the other members in this Chamber. The Minister of Local Government agreed with me previously that when this fund was originally formed it was not intended for any purpose of eradication. This fund was set up and paid

for by the people who sell cattle, and it was designed to compensate them for any loss resulting from the destruction or condemnation of cattle because of certain diseases. I do not accept the fact that \$25,000 is needed at this stage for an expansion of this programme. Up to the present, some \$10,000 to \$12,000 has been spent every year out of general revenue for the eradication of tuberculosis in South Australia.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That is about the same amount as the interest on the fund at the present time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. This Government, in an endeavour to appear magnanimous, is saying to people, "The previous Government did not treat you correctly at all; we will pay you interest." However, suddenly it finds itself wanting the money back for the very purpose that was previously met from general revenue. I believe that \$13,000 has already been paid by the Government for interest on this fund. The interest at present is about \$11,000 to \$12,000 a year, so there have been interest payments already of about \$25,000. This is immediately available to the Minister for his purpose. If the expenditure is about \$16,000 to \$18,000 a year (as I understand it will be), there will be a carryover, from the \$25,000 of interest already paid, of \$7,000 or \$8,000. In the following year it will amount to \$12,000 or \$13,000. So we already have two to three years at the rate that the Government wishes to spend from the interest of this fund.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Then why object to it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I want to know why the Minister wants to go to \$25,000 and possibly cut into the capital of this fund, which was never set up for the purpose of the eradication of any disease. Incidentally, the disease is not restricted to bovine tuberculosis: it can be actinomycosis, pleuro-pneumonia or one of a whole series of diseases mentioned in the principal Act. There is no case for the Government's cutting into this fund. The Minister of Agriculture said that he would drop this Bill completely if we did not agree to his limitation of \$25,000.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Shot-gun tactics.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is even worse than that because, if the interest payments are accepted, he will have available to him for two or three years all the money he is requesting at present. The other interesting question about restricting the amount of money to

\$15,000, \$20,000 or \$25,000 is: what guarantee has this Committee that this Government will continue its present rate of interest for this fund? Next year it could say that the interest would be  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent or  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent—and then where would the fund stand? There is no guarantee in this Bill of the interest rates to be paid. If the Minister wanted to get more money from the fund, perhaps he could have the interest rates increased from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent to 4 per cent or  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, but with the present interest rates there is sufficient money for the Minister to carry out what he wants to do this year, next year and the following year. I see nothing wrong with this amendment.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am happy to accept the Minister's rebuke (I probably earned it) but I do not hold that the Minister's opinion has any greater force than that of some authorities I know. I do not believe that, because he is a politician or a Minister, his decision on any matter should be final. I went to some lengths to find out the various feelings of the men concerned, most of them being, possibly, bigger contributors to this fund than the Minister is. The disease is not out of hand, nor is it likely to be. This campaign is thought desirable by the department because of pressure brought to bear upon it by United States cattle men, who are opposed to our competing with them in the United States. It is not thought that a heavy expenditure is likely or necessary in the near future to eradicate bovine tuberculosis, but extra money is needed to step up the programme. If the cattle men were prepared to make some money available and it was not sufficient for the campaign (as this is a national issue it affects not merely the cattle men but all Australians) perhaps the Government would subsidize it, even at the rate of 50c for every dollar. Had the department approached the various bodies representing the contributors to this fund, some easy solution could have been found and a programme outlined with which everyone would have been satisfied. Introducing a Bill providing for access to the Cattle Compensation Fund in this way was neither fair nor desirable. This amendment indicates that I am not opposed to some assistance being given to the department's programme but I strongly resist the fund itself being diminished.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Government's main difficulty in getting the Bill passed is of its own creation, because we have not been given sufficient information about the cost of the tuberculosis testing scheme in the past or what an extension of the

scheme would cost in the future. All that this Bill does it to ask for funds to be made available to extend that scheme. It does not ask for funds to be made available to continue the scheme that has operated over the years. It asks only for an extension of the scheme, and it is evident from the scanty information we have been given that the interest from the Cattle Compensation Fund will be sufficient for this purpose. The Minister has said it would be far better to use money from this fund to stamp out the disease rather than be involved in paying compensation, but let us remember that the Cattle Compensation Fund is concerned with more diseases than bovine tuberculosis. It is concerned with a number of diseases named in the Cattle Compensation Act. Also, an amendment of 1962 states:

The Governor may from time to time by proclamation declare any disease affecting cattle to be a disease for the purposes of this Act.

As we have to meet some named diseases, and some diseases not named at present, it is incumbent upon this Chamber to see that the present Cattle Compensation Fund is not eroded. That is all we are trying to do. We are not trying to restrict the campaign to extend the testing scheme. Every honourable member agrees that the scheme should be extended, and we are prepared to make the interest in the fund available for this purpose.

If after proper trial it is found that the interest from the fund is insufficient for this purpose, that there is too big a drain on general revenue (and it will take some time to get this extended testing scheme into operation) and that after two or three years more funds are required, the Government can always return to Parliament, place the situation clearly before us, indicate what the eventual cost is likely to be and ask us to look again at the situation. In that time the Cattle Compensation Fund will have grown to some extent and perhaps Parliament will then agree to further funds being made available. In the meantime let us get on with the scheme. Sufficient money will be made available for extending it. Let us find out what funds are required and to what extent the scheme need be extended.

It is true that the Minister said that if he could not get his own way the Bill would be dropped then he is only trying to blackmail us. We are not indulging in delaying tactics; we are only trying to protect a fund that has been created by the cattle owners themselves. The Government is saying that if the scheme is extended it must be paid for by the cattle owners. They are prepared to pay for it, but

it is not fair to ask them to pay for what general revenue has provided over the years. Under the Minister's suggestion the Government would be limited to a specific sum in any one year, whereas under the amendment there is no restriction. If the interest is more than is required in the first year, it can be carried over into the second and third years. I support the amendment.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am glad to hear the Minister's attitude on this matter, as the Bill should be dropped. The correct method of financing this matter, if the money is to be obtained from the cattle growers, is by increasing killing fees, not by taking this money that belongs to the cattle owners. The magnanimous attitude taken by the Government is that, as it has provided this money in the form of interest, it can be used for revenue expenditure. This is the first time I have heard of any acceptance of the principle that interest belongs other than to the capital from which it originates. If the Minister of Agriculture wanted extra money from the cattle growers, he should have introduced a Bill to increase the duty for one specific purpose.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I support the amendment. I am completely opposed to any eroding of the Cattle Compensation Fund but, as an expansion of the testing programme is necessary, I said during the second reading debate that I would consider using the interest from the fund for this purpose. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and other honourable members have mentioned, for the first two or three years the interest, including the accrued interest, would cover the situation, so there would be little or no need for supplementary money to be taken from general revenue. I cannot understand why the Government is not prepared to accept this worthwhile amendment. I dislike intensely the threat the Government makes that we either pass the Bill exactly as the Government wants it or it will be dropped. There has been too much of this sort of thing. The Hon. Mr. Whyte's amendment is a good one, and I support it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Bill contains what the Government desires. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said that there is \$13,000 in interest in the fund now, plus the accrued interest in any particular year. This would amount to about \$25,000, which was the suggested maximum amount in the Bill. Mr. DeGaris also said that there would be a

carryover into the next financial year. If the \$25,000 is not required this year for further testing, that is all the better. What are honourable members afraid of? Mr. DeGaris said that he did not think the money would be spent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I didn't say that.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member said that probably it would not be spent: that about \$18,000 would be spent, and the remainder would carry over. If this is so, what is wrong in having a limitation of \$25,000?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There is no guarantee of interest. How do we know it will be the same?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There is no guarantee that there will be a balance in the fund if there is an outbreak of disease for which compensation would have to be paid. The Minister of Agriculture said he will accept an amendment limiting the amount to \$25,000, but that this is the best he will do. If the Government has not the right to decide what it will or will not accept on a governmental measure, I do not know who has. The information given me by the Minister of Agriculture is that if this is not accepted he will not accept the amendment; that he would rather sacrifice the Bill. If anybody is using political blackmail it is the Opposition.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It does not happen to be the Government's money in this case.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Members opposite do not like it when the boot is on the other foot. When it pinches they start to squeal. If the amendment is carried the Minister will not necessarily accept it. I cannot see anything wrong with the limitation of \$25,000 in any one financial year.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think we are winning because, from my long experience of the Minister, when we make an impression he usually rumbles very loudly.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not like the term "blackmail".

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have not said anything about blackmail. I have tried to put the position as clearly as possible from the point of view of owners of this fund, who are the producers. The owners are entitled to some say on how the money or the interest therefrom is spent, and I am one of the spokesmen for these owners. I should like the Minister to tell the Committee what the

alleged discussions were and with whom they were held. I also want to know if the Minister of Agriculture had a firm or gentleman's agreement with some producers. I suggest that he did not. I have here a document from the United Farmers & Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, addressed to me, and it reads:

Sir,

**Cattle Compensation Fund**

I desire to inform you that the question of the Cattle Compensation Fund was discussed at the State Conference of the United Farmers & Graziers of South Australia Incorporated last week in Adelaide. After a lengthy discussion on this matter the following resolution was carried:

That the United Farmers & Graziers of South Australia Incorporated oppose any legislative action which proposes the appropriation of moneys from the special fund being allocated to any other fund than that for which the money was received.

I trust you will give this matter your favourable consideration.

Thanking you,

T. C. STOTT, M.P.,  
General Secretary.

That is an unsolicited testimonial, and the members of that organization passed that resolution.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How many were there?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I thought the honourable member would have received an invitation to that function.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The Minister called it a red letter day.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, he opened the conference and had a great deal to say.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: There were 36 persons present, 10 of whom we did not know.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was a large conference and it represented a wide section of the community because it represented certain cattle, dairying, poultry, pastoral and wheatgrowing interests. All of these people have helped provide the funds in the hands of the Government and all are interested in preserving those funds for the purpose for which they were raised. I believe if we break down on this matter it will be the forerunner of other such breakdowns. I have had experience of another fund where some departmental officers became enthusiastic about using phylloxera funds raised from vine growers in one area for an entirely different

purpose, namely, for eradicating fruit fly in another part of the State. Fortunately we were able to nip that in the bud before it went any further. I have never deviated on this matter and in all sincerity I ask the Minister of Local Government to approach the Minister of Agriculture and urge him to handle this matter in the same way as the mover of the resolution I mentioned approached it when he was lambasted by the Minister for welsling on an agreement. All that the Hon. Mr. Whyte was attempting to do was find a compromise, and I think it was unfortunate that the Minister should have taken to Mr. Whyte as he did, because the honourable member showed great tolerance.

I hope the Minister in charge of the Bill in this Chamber will try to convey that same tolerance to the Minister in another place. This Committee is a responsible and properly-constituted body forming part of the Parliamentary system and it should not be scrubbed off as a fifth wheel. It is part of the institution of Parliament and represents people whose assets at the moment are in danger of being eroded. The Committee, in my opinion, has adopted a proper attitude in saying: "Yes, use all the interest that accrues from the fund; there will be enough to carry out the programme. If that amount should fall short in the first couple of years, then take funds from general revenue and do not dip into this fund."

The Committee divided on the suggested amendment:

Ayes (14).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte (teller).

Noes (4).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan (teller), C. M. Hill, and A. F. Kneebone.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.  
Suggested amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.  
Bill read a third time and passed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 4.23 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 8, at 2.15 p.m.