LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 16, 1966.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I asked last week regarding water supply on the southern end of Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague the Minister of Works has informed me that the Minister of Mines recently reported that the Mines Department had completed its investigations into the Carribie freshwater basin on southern Yorke Peninsula, and that computations from the pumping tests are in progress. It is apparent that the basin comprises two sub-basins of small areas. The basin is only 14ft. above sea level and carefully controlled development will be necessary to prevent access by sea water. Not more than 1,000,000 gallons a day should be withdrawn from the basin for prolonged periods. To supplement the above information, my colleague has supplied the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

> From the statement given by the Minister of Mines it is apparent that the Carribie basin will be suitable for limited development, and that a small area in southern Yorke Peninsula could be supplied from this basin. As soon as the report is received from the Mines Department an investigation will be made and a scheme prepared for the development of the Carribie basin.

SOFTWOOD PLANTINGS.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Forests, an answer to the question I asked on July 6 regarding land purchases for softwood plantings in South Australia?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There has been a delay in answering the honourable member's question because, unfortunately, the papers were put in the wrong file in the office. The figures of land purchases cited by the honourable member were brought up to date by the Minister of Forests in the House of Assembly on June 22 last, in a reply to a question asked by Mr. Burdon, M.P. Also, at that time the Minister informed Mr. Burdon of the localities where this land has been purchased. The figures were 2,631 acres in the South-East and 1,384 acres in the Adelaide Hills, there being a total of 3,916 acres purchased or approved to purchase. In reply to the Hon. Mr. Hart's further question, I would say that it is not the department's policy to publish the prices paid for individual areas. It is, however, general practice to purchase according to valuations made by the Government Land Board.

MOUNT GAMBIER INDUSTRY.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to the question I asked recently concerning the closing of an industry at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. A similar question was asked in another place, and I draw the honourable member's attention to *Hansard* dated August 10, 1966, at pages 964-5, which contains the detailed reply given by my colleague, the Premier.

SOUTH ROAD INTERSECTION.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Minister of Roads an answer to my question concerning the installation of traffic lights at the Sturt and South Roads intersection?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The reconstruction of the South Road between Walsh Avenue and the River Sturt is in progress. This is a major work, and the reconstruction of the Sturt Road intersection is expected to be completed during 1967. Traffic lights are planned to be installed at the intersection immediately construction is completed. Work is at present proceeding as fast as circumstances permit, and cannot be further expedited.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In view of the reply just given by the Chief Secretary to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris about Mount Gambier industry, I point out that I have had similar replies. As I understand the position, these two Houses of Parliament work completely separately, and I think it behoves the Minister to give an honourable member who asks a question a full reply in this Chamber. Can the Chief Secretary assure me that this will be done in the future?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to oblige. It was only at lunchtime that I saw the answer in the bag, so that it will have to be the same reply as that given in another place.

BURRA COPPER.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Can the Minister of Mines indicate whether the company that is exploring for copper in the Burra district is still, in fact, drilling for copper in that area, and also say what progress reports, if any, are available to date?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have given answers on various occasions on this matter. The company that has a lease at Burra is drilling for copper in that area, and this work is proceeding under the terms of its lease of the area in an endeavour to prove whether there are further lodes of copper in the whole area. The drilling is confined not only to the area where the open-cut mining took place in earlier days, but extending back to the area held by the council, part of which has been used as a football ground. The company is exploring to ascertain whether copper in commercial quantities can be found. If it is not discovered, under the terms of the lease the company will be finally treating the proven low-grade ore and extracting the copper from the mullock that will be left.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several amendments, mainly of an administrative nature, to the principal Act. The effect of the amendment to section 13 of the principal Act contained in clause 3 of the Bill is that the exemption from registration conferred by that section on tractors, bulldozers, graders and other like vehicles used for road work or for making firebreaks is removed and instead, by clause 4 (*b*), which adds a new paragraph to section 31 of the principal Act, it is provided that such vehicles may be registered without fee. This amendment is in accordance with the policy that as many vehicles as possible using the roads should be registered and thus identified by number plates, whether or not any fee for registration is payable.

Section 31 is also amended by clause 4 (*a*), which extends the privilege of free registration granted to consular officers to the personnel of foreign embassies. An office of the Netherlands Government Emigration Service is now established here and it is possible that in the future other diplomatic offices will be established. Section 30 of the principal Act provides that registration fees are to be calculated to the nearest shilling, but there is no such provision in section 55 relating to refunds. This section is amended by clause 5 to provide that refunds shall be calculated to the nearest multiple of 10c, any amount of 5c or less being disregarded.

Section 60 of the principal Act provides that, where the buyer of a registered motor vehicle fails to apply for transfer of the registration within 14 days, the registration will be cancelled and there will be no refund. This provision has operated harshly in the past and it is considered that voiding the registration in all cases is too severe. The amendments of this section made by paragraphs (*a*) and (*c*) of clause 6 will enable the Registrar, when he cancels the registration, to make a refund in respect of the unexpired portion of the registration less an amount of $4. Paragraph (*b*) of this clause enables an application for transfer of ownership to be made by a transferee where the transferee in any previous transaction has omitted to do so. Clause 7 inserts new section 71a in the principal Act. The new section recognizes an existing practice by empowering the Registrar to register motor vehicles in business names. Subsection (2) of the new section provides that upon such registration the provisions of the principal Act will apply to all persons carrying on the business, but it will be sufficient if any one of them complies therewith.

The amendment of section 83 made by clause 8 is of a drafting nature, the words inserted having previously been left out. The section as amended will provide for an appeal against the cancellation or suspension, as well as the refusal, of a driving instructor's licence. The purpose of clause 9 is to confer on inspectors appointed under the principal Act and those under the Road Traffic Act power to require the production of a driving licence for the purpose of identification. There is need for this power in view of the additional duties such inspectors may be called upon to discharge under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963. Section 98a of the principal Act requires that all driving instructors be licensed. Many public authorities, such as the Electricity Trust and the Municipal Tramways Trust, have their own instructors and it is considered unnecessary that such instructors should be required to undergo a test by the Registrar and to be licensed by him. The amendment contained in clause 10 will exempt employees of public authorities who are approved by the Registrar from the requirements of section 98a so long as those employees are acting in the normal course of their employment.

Clause 11 makes two unconnected amendments to section 102 of the principal Act. The first amendment (paragraph (*a*)) provides that the fixed minimum penalties provided by the section will not apply in respect of an uninsured trailer. The minimum penalty prescribed is a fine of not less than $40 and disqualification from driving for not less than three months unless there are special reasons for reducing it. There has, however, been judicial criticism that the minimum penalty has operated too harshly in many instances, particularly if the offence relates to an uninsured trailer.

Clause 11 (*b*) inserts three new subsections in section 102 relating to a resident of another State who is temporarily driving in this State and whose third party policy is granted by an insurer in the other State. The driver at present commits an offence against section 102 because he would be driving here without an insurance policy granted by "an approved insurer" within the meaning of section 104 of the principal Act. New section 102 (4) provides that he will not commit an offence here if the vehicle is registered in a proclaimed State and he has a policy, corresponding to our third party insurance, which extends to his driving in this State. As the other States now have legislation comparable with ours, they may be proclaimed for this purpose. New subsection (5) and (6) are normal machinery provisions.

Clause 12 inserts new section 111a in the principal Act providing that where a person is killed by negligence in the use of an insured motor vehicle and he, leaving no surviving relatives as frequently happens, is buried at public expense, the Treasurer may recover the cost of the burial from the third party insurance company. Clause 13 is consequential on clause 11 (*b*) and excludes from the definition of "uninsured motor vehicle" in section 116 (1) any vehicle which is temporarily within the State as mentioned in new section 102 (4). The effect of this is that no action may be brought against the nominal defendant if any such vehicle is involved in an accident. Clause 14 amends section 118 of the principal Act relating to claims against an insurer by the spouse of the insured person. Where bodily injury is caused by negligence of an insured person to his or her spouse the injured spouse may recover damages against the insurer, but there is considerable doubt whether such a right exists if the injury was caused before marriage. The Government considers that there should be a remedy in this case and, accordingly, section 118 (1) is amended so as to extend the scope of the section to cover the case of an injury incurred before marriage.

By virtue of the amendment to section 118 (5) the new right of action will be conferred retrospectively to extend to all cases where the marriage—upon which any such right of action would have abated—occurred within three years before this Bill becomes law. The Government considers this to be a gap in the law which should not have existed and that to deny any remedy because the two parties concerned marry after the injury would be an injustice. One such case has been brought to the attention of the Government and there may be others. Clause 15 is consequential on clause 7 and provides that registration of a motor vehicle in a business name will be *prima facie* evidence that any person carrying on the business is the owner of the vehicle. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 1002.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): This Bill increases the total amount of revenue from land tax. The aggregate increase above the 1964-65 level of $2,856,000 is due largely to the steep increase in the quinquennial assessments under the present administration. Many assessments have increased by much more than the average market value of properties in the area. I consider that the formula in the Land Tax Act by which the Commissioner arrives at these assessments is faulty, in that the sales of small parcels of land that bear no relation to the prices that could be expected for living areas do affect land values in the district. In many districts the steep increase gives land values in excess, perhaps, of what adjoining properties may bring on the market, although the values are still within the formula. The Minister in his second reading explanation said much about percentages, but the real comparison regarding land tax depends on the dollars and cents that taxpayers have to pay and the increase in total revenue.

Research into the history of land tax in South Australia shows that as late as 1961-62 the total tax levied was less than the increase that has occurred since the Government took office last year. In the 16 years from 1949-50 to 1964-65, which included the period of a

sharp increase in land values following the wool boom and the abolition of fixed land values, and also the period when the Commonwealth vacated the land taxation field, no increase in State land tax equalled the extra $2,100,000 proposed this year or the aggregate increase of about $3,000,000 that has been considered by this Parliament in fewer than 12 months.

A close scrutiny of the trend of land tax levied by the previous Government in the 16 years to which I have referred shows that there were seven rises because of quinquennial assessments and an increased value of new housing subdivisions, but in the same period there were eight reductions or concessions given. Although it is realized that the present Government is in financial difficulties, we also have to consider the economy of the State with all the problems of unemployment and the slowing down of development. It is an accepted principle of Government finance that increased taxation will slow down the economy still further and it is disturbing to find that the Government has offered no solution to the grave problems facing the State other than a programme of increasing taxation.

Land tax is a tax on working capital and the cost is inevitably borne by the community. This increased cost affects all branches of primary, secondary and tertiary industry, as well as commerce. In some industries, such as the wheat industry, part of the cost is passed on to the consumer, because the home consumption price of wheat under the price stabilization scheme is based on the cost of production. Inevitably some of this extra cost must be passed on. The woolgrower, of course, has no redress. He will pay more for the things he buys and in addition he will pay his own tax. He will have to meet all this from his own reserves.

Poultry farmers will not only have to pay more for their wheat but will also have to pay more for the other goods they buy for the conduct of their industry. The extra cost to commerce and secondary industry may be passed on to the consumer, but we must also keep in mind that secondary industry has to compete with industry overseas and in States where this particular tax is more favourable. It is also disturbing to find that some smaller properties are being brought into this taxation field. These properties produce the milk, butter, fruit, potatoes and vegetables that are part of every housewife's daily budget. I was surprised to find that the Government rejected an amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition in another place.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: If I may phrase it in another way, Mr. President, I am surprised at the Government's opposition to an increase in the lower exemption rate that has applied in section 11 of the Land Tax Act. We have a sharp increase in land assessments at present and varying figures have been given. One published figure was that the increase overall was 60 per cent, and it has also been said that the proportion of the increase to be borne by rural lands is about 45 per cent. Whichever figure is correct, any move to increase this lower exemption rate in proportion to the increase in assessment, even at the lower figure of 45 per cent, will merely maintain an existing concession. I am surprised at the Government's attitude and hope that it will reconsider the matter. The small landholder will be affected, particularly as the closer steps in the scale of the new tax mean a sharp increase in the lower levels. For instance, the first step means an increase in the tax rate of 100 per cent and, again, each step in the lower levels considerably increases the percentage of tax payable.

The small landholders concerned will be seriously affected by any future increase. The percentage of rural holdings in South Australia under 200 acres is 42.68, according to the 1965 *Year Book*. The increasing of this concession figure will not affect those who are purely wheat and wool farmers, because a living area on such farms would have an assessment much in excess of anything that this particular section would cover. The concession would apply mainly to the dairying industries and potato growers, the Upper Murray irrigation area, the Lower Murray dairying areas, and the dairying and potato growing areas in the Lower South-East. I would have thought that the Government would show particular concern for these areas, because they are represented by Government members.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The people you refer to have no capacity to meet a higher charge.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: We are talking about what could be called the more depressed sections of primary production. There is the citrus industry to consider, where there has been some investigation in an endeavour to stabilize prices. There is the potato industry, where we have had difficulty in the marketing of potatoes. There is the grape industry, where again there has been

a problem in the marketing of the crop. There is a move to introduce a stabilized marketing scheme for each of these various products. Inevitably, if we do have a stabilized scheme, these increased costs will be passed on to the consumer. I understand that a concession of this kind would mean a cost of only $45,000 to $50,000, which is very small compared with the overall increase in approximately 12 months of almost $3,000,000.

This cost of $45,000 to $50,000 would be far exceeded in the eventual costs passed on to the community. I make this plea because I think that because of the financial position of the Government at present, and the rather desperate situation that exists as regards revenue, it would be very difficult to alter the Bill substantially. Such a small concession would be reasonable. This Council did the landholders, and particularly the economy of the State, a very good service last year when it limited the application of the increased rate to one year so that a new rate must be considered following the quinquennial assessment. This resulted in a saving of almost $2,000,000 annually. Because of the saving made last year by this Chamber, and because of the present financial position of the Government and the economy of the State, I reluctantly support the Bill, but reserve the right to speak to clause 5 when the measure is in Committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I do not propose to vote against the Bill. Like the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, I find myself in the position where I must reluctantly support it, but at the same time I criticize the Government most severely for being in the position of finding it necessary to have this revenue measure, and for such an amount.

The Government seeks an extra $2,100,000 under this Bill, because it is in urgent need of revenue and, quite obviously, it must have the money. I cannot but help mention the great dangers that are involved in this kind of taxation, and the great dangers to the economy that are involved in going too far with this kind of sectional or capital taxation. This is a tax that takes from some and not from others. It will particularly affect the commercial and industrial sectors of the State.

The tax goes up to $7.15 a head of population; it goes up to an amount of about 10 per cent higher than the Australian average. Although the Minister went to great lengths to explain the reasons why this has occurred, the fact still remains that now, in this field of land tax, we are going to a point where we are about 10 per cent higher than the Australian average. We are going to this figure of $7.15 a head from the previous figure of $5.30. This is quite a big jump from the amount charged in 1965-66.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The only real comparison would be between 1964-65. There have been two bites at the cherry.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, by the increased assessment and now the increased rate. This is happening at a time when considerable economic problems are facing the State, particularly unemployment. This morning I read in the press that for the second month following South Australia had the worst percentage of unemployment to the total population of any State. There is a great need to reduce unemployment and we all acknowledge this fact. One way to reduce it would be to encourage expansion and development of industry, thereby absorbing unemployed people. I cannot help but ask the question, "Are we, in fact, encouraging expansion and development if at the same time we increase taxation of this kind?"

The need is surely there to give incentive to commerce and industry so that they can set about planning, expanding, and employing people who are unemployed, but we tend to take away the incentive by taxation of this kind. If we increase taxation too much, we absolutely kill the incentive. We hear much loose talk about the group of people generally spoken of as employers, and statements are made that they do not work particularly hard but make considerable profits. This is not altogether the truth. They do work hard, and the average employer makes only a fair and reasonable profit. If we curb an employer's incentive to make this profit, and if we try to limit the profit motive, we lose the incentive, and in this way we shall have additional unemployment in this State.

One way we are tending to do this is by over-taxing, and we are certainly over-taxing in this measure. Industrialists who come to Australia and plan to establish in this State look at our statistics and economy. They see that the tax is spiralling, compared with the Australian average. With these facts before them, I wonder whether they will establish here or go elsewhere.

From the point of view of commerce and industry, men in this sector are asking, "Why doesn't the Government apply business principles to its own financing and accounting?" If that type of approach were employed the Government would not be in its present position,

and taxation as severe as it is in this Bill would not be needed. I refer shortly to the city of Adelaide, in which, as honourable members know, I take some interest.

I am pleased that the Adelaide City Council, together with other local government bodies, will benefit by the exemption mentioned in clause 4 of the Bill, that local government properties will be exempt from tax under this measure. It will help particularly the city of Adelaide in its programme for the establishment of off-street car parks, which is vital to the city's interests. It ranks, with the need to develop residentially the city, as one of the two greatest problems facing the city at the moment. The city will benefit in some way by this exemption, so I am pleased to see it included.

From the city's point of view, land tax has other disturbing aspects. It will affect not only the city but also the Government and the State, because it is highly desirable that the city remain the thriving heart of the whole State. The position now within the city is not particularly good. Landlords are finding, with a tax of this kind that they will have to pay (and especially those who own old large buildings in valuable positions), that some tenants are reluctant to carry this increased taxation, and rather than carry it they tend to move out; so there are many vacancies at present in the older buildings within the city. As they move out, because this type of tax cannot be passed on to the tenant by the landlord, those buildings come on the market, that being the present trend.

We are tending to have an over-supply of city properties on the market, so, when they are ultimately sold, they realize lower prices; as that happens, so a lower range of values becomes established; and with that come lower assessments. Lower assessments of site values adversely affect the Government's income.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Then it raises the rate.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is one way of doing it; I suppose that has been done previously. It has reached the stage now where values are tending to decrease, which benefits no-one. A 20 per cent increased assessment is mentioned in respect of city values, which includes North Adelaide. There has been a considerable increase in some areas within North Adelaide and in the terrace frontages of the city proper. That is where the real increase has occurred. This ultimate loss of income affects not only the Government but also the city itself.

In 1964-65 the city received in rates $2,308,482. I believe the Land Tax Department received a figure in excess of that (about $2,500,000) in its taxation over the same area. So we have a situation in which the Government is receiving more from land tax than a local government body receives from rates. Generally speaking, the city is reaching a point where it cannot be taxed further.

This land tax, of course, goes into general revenue and is spent throughout the whole State, whilst the city's rates go into expenditures not only for the city itself but also in helping people other than city ratepayers. For example, there are the park lands, enjoyed not only by most people within the metropolitan area but also by country people when they happen to be in the city. The city supplies them with services, too, in contributing to developments that can be called State developments—for instance, the new festival hall, which will benefit the whole State.

Apart from this form of tax, we have the Engineering and Water Supply Department tax based on an annual assessment and not on usage. The ratepayers are being bled white and only a small portion of that money goes back into the city itself. The city is concerned about some streets that are now run-down in their development and progress—for example, Waymouth Street, Franklin Street, Flinders Street and, to a lesser extent, Pirie Street.

We notice this falling-off in development. We strongly suspect that this overall increase in taxation is one of the main reasons. The general effect on the ratepayer is that he often moves out; those who stay have the same criticism of this measure as those in the commercial and industrial world, whom I mentioned previously.

In the suburban areas, we have an increase of 85 per cent, as mentioned in the Minister's second reading explanation. That increase deals with the assessment. It is not perhaps a particularly large amount of money involved compared with the whole, because each individual assessment in the suburbs is not very high; but I think the main increase in the assessment has occurred in two places—first, along the arterial roads that run through the suburban areas (where I think the assessments previously tended to be a little low) and, secondly, in the outlying areas, especially the newer suburbs where subdivisions and estates have been established and where undoubtedly because of this development land values have risen considerably. Many newer suburbs are within the area that I serve—for instance, in the southern foothills from Seacliff running around through

Darlington, eastward to Marion, and then to directly south of the city in the Springbank area.

These householders, despite the reduced rate, will undoubtedly be paying a little more money than they are at present. Of course, they are paying the price of having brought to power a Government that made extravagant election promises. The money has to be found somewhere to meet those promises. So, generally, I say that the commercial and industrial people of this State consider this measure to be particularly harsh. They are concerned that it is curbing their incentive to expand; it is restricting them in absorbing the present unemployment. I, with many others in this State, look forward to the day when increased revenue of this kind will not be necessary to help adjust deficit revenue accounts of the State.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): It is not my intention to speak at length on this measure partly because other members have already given detailed comparisons of the incidence of this tax under the previous Government and under this Government. They also made comparisons with regard to various areas of the State and it would be redundant if I were to repeat those examples or gave similar ones; therefore, I shall not elaborate unduly. Basically, as has always been the case with previous Governments, this tax is anathema. It is a capital levy; there is no question about that, and it is a capital levy on property and the property owner. Those honourable members (unfortunately, there are none in the Ministry) who pause to think about it know perfectly well that the man who derives his income from the land has no practical way, in 90 per cent of cases, to pass that tax on, although there are reasonable avenues in both the commercial and industrial world. That makes this tax even more obnoxious, because it is applied to one section of the community in its worst application as against, in many cases, no application whatever to other sections.

I will give two examples. First, the wealthy flat dweller who obtains his unearned income from shares held overseas or in other States: how does he contribute in helping the State's disastrous financial position? He escapes the application of the tax imposed by a spendthrift Government that does not know where it is going, nor does it know where to turn—it is scraping the bottom of the barrel in an effort to find any means of getting revenue from somewhere. Secondly, take the case of the major indent agent: what does he contribute? He is a wealthy man: how does he contribute to the State to overcome the Government's ever-growing deficit? Is he asked to do anything? Not at all! And yet one or two sections of the community are asked to prop up the finances of the Government today (let alone sustain them—that would be impossible!) while others virtually escape the incubus altogether.

We have heard on several occasions in debates on other Bills during the life of this Government much talk about "living areas" and declarations that the man in the country should be exempted if he has only a living area. We have already in the previous session argued the merits of a living area with little success and with little apparent understanding among members of the Government and their supporters. However, it is interesting when such people talk about living areas that, under the recent assessment, hundreds of people, and probably thousands, have been brought into the taxing scale of land tax when, in the opinion of understanding people, they barely hold a living area.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Many of them have less than a living area, of course.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I agree. I thought I was being reasonable in my comments. We are told that this Government is taxing the larger man; that was the Government's policy when it was elected, and I am not disputing that. Part of its programme was to tax only the large landholder but then, with crocodile tears, the Government has been suggesting it is exempting the little man, yet by means of the assessment (I presume it must have been an accident) it is trying to bring him into it!

The word "exemption" does not mean anything to the Government. This means the little man is going to pay something, and if that is an exemption (when a person has not paid anything before) then I do not know how it can be explained. All I can say is that my mathematics cannot quite handle that position, even if the mathematics of other members can do so. The truth is that this Government is straining every endeavour to keep its deficits from roaring into an inferno, let alone merely contain them. The Government is trying to apply this increase in tax to the "haves"—large, small and little "haves", who are least likely to support the Government at any price. They cannot be bought and therefore they have to pay, that is what it amounts to. I shall not indicate until the Committee stages how I intend to vote on the Bill.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 11. Page 1005.)

Clause 9—"Time of payment of water rates", to which the Hon. M. B. Dawkins had moved an amendment.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Since last week I have had it put to me that the amendment I moved perhaps was not strictly in line with the Constitution Act as it affects money Bills and I therefore seek leave to withdraw that amendment with the object of submitting a suggested amendment on similar lines.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I move the following suggested amendment:

In new section 94 (2) after "construed" to insert "(*a*)" and at the end of this section to insert:

; or

(*b*) in any case where land is situated within country lands proclaimed as a water district under Part VI of this Act, to prevent the owner or occupier of such land (in lieu of paying his water rates and minimum charges for water by measure under agreement in four equal payments as provided under subsection (1) of this section) from electing, within fourteen days of the receipt of a notice for the first quarterly amount that is due and payable in any year, by notice in writing to the Minister, to pay such rates and charges for water in respect of such land by one annual payment in respect of the total amount of rates and charges that are due and payable for that year.

(3) Upon such election as is referred to in paragraph (*b*) of subsection (2) of this section being made the owner or occupier shall, on demand, pay his rates and charges in full by one annual payment.

(4) No demand for payment as is mentioned in subsection (3) of this section shall be made upon an owner or occupier who has made the election as aforesaid, before the thirty-first day of December in any year in which such rates and charges are due and payable.

I have pointed out the motive behind this amendment, and still consider that something ought to be done to allow people who wish to pay in one amount to elect to do so. As I have said, there is no compulsion, but merely a provision that a man may do this if he so desires. He would have to pay his full rate at December 31, whereas the Government would not get the full amount until, probably, March 31 or April 1 of the next year under the system of quarterly payment.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I said last week that consideration would be given to the amendment on honourable members' files. That consideration has been given and the amendment before us is, in effect, not greatly different from the one submitted last week. I have considered the matter, in consultation with the Minister of Works and some of his officers, and submit that there is really no need for this amendment, because of the attitude that the department has taken over the years. Cases of real hardship have been dealt with on their merits and will be dealt with in that way in future, irrespective of the category into which the ratepayer falls, whether farmer, pensioner, or anything else. The department considers that strong objection should be taken to this amendment because, if we accept it, how can other sections of the community who come along with a similar proposition be resisted?

We know that annual payment is provided for in the Bill. The Bill also enables people, when they get the first notice, to pay for one-quarter or for one year. When the second notice is received, they can pay for one quarter, or for the remainder of the year. No person is required to pay, before December 31, more than half of the water rates due. My colleague and I consider that the situation is covered adequately. No farmer would be obliged to pay more than half his annual water rate before February.

Surely it is no compliment to the rural community to suggest that the management of their financial affairs is so poor that they are unable to meet half their commitments for water rates before they dispose of their produce. The application of this amendment is general. It is saying that, generally, the farmer has to have this proposal. I consider it a poor compliment to the people in the country.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is not suggested at all: it was suggested that it might help some who were in difficulty regarding paying each year.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have said that they are covered by the attitude of the department, whereby anybody, irrespective of the category he is in, is considered if he suffers hardship. I do not think this amendment is necessary, because the benefits are not great when we look at how the rates can be paid as well as at the department's attitude.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I commend my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, for bringing forward this amendment. I think it was the proper thing to do. I agree with the Minister

that the department has been generous in this matter in the past but I do not go along with him when he says that this amendment is somewhat of an indictment of country people who cannot manage their affairs very well. It is not just a matter of managing one's affairs. I know the real reason for providing for quarterly payments.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What is it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The real reason is that the Government wants to get money quickly at present, and it needs that money. However, one of the reasons stated for quarterly payments was that this would make it easier for people on fixed incomes, who found difficulty in amassing the amount of money necessary to pay for 12 months' rates at one time. It has been stated many times here that the farmer nowadays has a greater diversification in production and that, therefore, he is receiving some income all the year round, but many primary industries have just one harvest and one payment a year. In my area, they are one crop a year and one payment a year people.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Do they receive their money before Christmas?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Many payments are made in November, whereas others, as in the case of the wine industry, are made at June 30. In these days, shearing is not done at the same time throughout the State and certain areas fit into a pattern. I think the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was trying to make provision for people who had this particular problem. The man on the basic wage will not be affected, because he will still be able to pay on a three-monthly basis. Also, some farmers will not be affected. However, this a provision for—

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Where the situation exists.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Quite. I consider that the department is being a little circumspect if it thinks everyone is paid out of one pool at one time.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This amendment covers that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask the Minister for his authority for the specific advice he gave regarding how one can pay this particular rate. This will no doubt help my colleague and other members, so that they may inform their constituents. I still consider that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was right in bringing forward this amendment.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I support the two previous speakers, but am disappointed that the Minister has not recognized the merits in the amendment. I appreciate that the Minister would prefer to see the Bill operate in a way that would facilitate the workings of his department; this is only logical, but he must not lose sight of the fact that some people who have been paying their water rates annually and who still wish to do so should not lose the convenience of continuing the practice because of the operation of the quarterly payment system. I have yet to be convinced that to pay one's water rates quarterly does not incur much extra expense and inconvenience, particularly to the country man who pays his rates by cheque. There is the need to write a cheque and pay stamp duty on it, to buy and address an envelope, and to affix a postage stamp to it. Surely it is more economical to do this once a year than four times a year. It means an added cost to primary industry, which today is getting added costs all along the line.

Only last week killing rates at the abattoirs were increased and land tax is to be increased. Primary producers are collecting increased costs all along the line, and if they attempt to reduce their costs they are baulked by Government departments. They want to be able to retain a convenience and privilege they have enjoyed for years. They accept the fact that if a person wants to pay his water rates quarterly he should be permitted to do so, but they do not want to be denied a convenience that they have had for a long period. The Minister is asking too much of a person when he says that that person should go along, cap in hand, to the department and expose his financial position to departmental officers in order to obtain a concession. The amendment goes a long way toward allowing a person to pay his rates annually, but he must apply in writing, which, in itself, is a little inconvenient, but we accept that position if anyone wants the concession. The amendment goes half way towards solving the problem. If the Minister is genuine in his desire to help primary producers, he should accept the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I support the amendment and appreciate the argument put forward by the speakers, particularly in relation to primary production. However, there is another angle to this problem. The fixing of a due date for the yearly payment of water rates is not, as the Minister said, a concession, because in connection with any yearly payment there is a due date. Under the Local Government Act rates are payable by February 28 of each year. If, under this Bill, an account goes out for a quarterly payment, no-one will pay the water rates yearly, because if a person pays the full 12 months' rates in advance he will get

no assistance, particularly if the due date is in the first quarter.

If a person elects to pay his rates yearly and wants to pay them three or four months after July, he will need to enter into correspondence with the department. I agree with what the Minister said—that the department has always been lenient in these matters. If there were a set due date for yearly payments, people would elect to pay on the yearly basis. Under the amendment a person must elect in writing that he wishes to pay yearly, but no-one will pay for the full 12 months if there is no due date.

The Minister said that a person can pay quarterly or annually. If he decides to pay quarterly, when he gets the next quarterly account he can elect to pay the quarterly amount or the amount for the next three-quarters. He will pay the quarterly amount. There will be no incentive for anyone to pay the amount for the full 12 months. The amendment is a very worthy one.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have a question that is related to the amendment and the original section. It is an administrative matter. Will the people liable to pay water rates have their attention directed to the right to elect to pay? The Bill provides for quarterly payments, but under the amendment there is the right to elect to pay in one instalment after December 31. I know that everyone is presumed to know the law, but unless the specific rights are disclosed to the people who have to pay rates they will not know that they have the right to elect. They will get a quarterly account for a quarterly amount and they will pay it. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, there will be no real incentive to pay in one amount for the full 12 months. In what way will the taxpayer's attention be drawn to the fact that he has the right to elect? Unless the taxpayer's attention is drawn to this provision, he will not know about it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I answer the Hon. Mr. Potter's points first. In another place, an amendment was moved to the Bill making it specific that there should be the option to pay either quarterly or annually. It was implicit in the amendment then moved that the ratepayer would receive notification that he could pay either quarterly or annually. The Minister of Works accepted the amendment on that basis. It is implicitly recorded that this shall be so, in order that the people will know. It has been stated that the real reason why the Government is doing this is to get the money in earlier. If the honourable member who made that suggestion will seriously think about it, he will realize that the Government will not get all the money in earlier: in fact, it will get less money in earlier. Eventually, at the end of the period when all the money should have been in, it will not, in fact, be in, because nobody will pay annually; everyone will pay quarterly. If the honourable member thinks about it, he will find that at the end of the period the Government will not have as much money in as it would have by the present method. Then the Hon. Mr. Hart said that people were being baulked in this regard. They are not—they are being given the opportunity.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: But they have not asked for that opportunity.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member said they are being baulked from paying annually. They are not; they can pay annually and that is provided for.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But they have to pay annually in the first quarter.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Clause 9 states:

Section 94 of the principal Act is repealed and re-enacted as follows:

> 94. (1) All water rates and minimum charges for water supplied by measure under agreement shall be payable in advance by equal payments on the first days of July, October, January and April in each year: Provided that the Governor may by proclamation vary the days on which such water rates and minimum charges for water shall be payable and in that event such rates and charges shall be so paid accordingly.
>
> (2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent any owner or occupier of land or premises from paying his water rates and minimum charges for water by measure under agreement in full in advance upon receipt of a notice for any quarterly amount that is due and payable.

As I indicated previously, this gives the taxpayer the right to pay annually.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But, if he pays annually, he must pay in the first quarter?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, if he pays annually, but he can pay quarterly, and in the subsequent quarter pay the balance.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: But that is not annually.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No, but it gets him out of the situation where it is said that people cannot afford to pay all their annual amounts before December 31. He can pay some of it before December 31 and the balance afterwards. I say that he is given the opportunity of doing this. That applies to the people that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins is

thinking of, but what about the people that the Hon. Mr. Story is thinking of? He said, "Oh yes, but other primary producers get their money later." Primary producers get their money at different times. There is no need for there to be any real hardship. These people can be taken care of as they are being accommodated today. The amendment should be rejected and the Bill remain as it is.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I appreciate what the Minister said in his first statement, that the department has not been difficult in these matters. The essential difference is that a person who pays annually up until now has not had to pay anything until towards the end of the calendar year. This means that in many places in the country at present a man does not have to pay until he has some money coming in, whereas if a man pays annually under the new scheme as it is at the moment he will have to pay in July, when he is probably scraping the bottom of the barrel. The essential difference between my amendment and the procedure advocated by the Minister is that under my amendment people who find it difficult to pay in July have the right to elect to pay in December, and they would pay it all in December. Thus, they would be paying some of it three months earlier than the Government would otherwise have got it. Under the Minister's scheme, he says the department would be considerate. I do not doubt that. Under my amendment, the person who felt he was in difficulties would have the right, by law, to elect to pay in December. Under the Minister's suggestion, perhaps it would not make much difference to the Government's financial position but the taxpayer would have to go cap in hand to the department and disclose the extent of his overdraft, and perhaps his bank manager's unwillingness to increase it; he would have to eat humble pie to get a special concession from the department to allow him to pay at the end of December.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I cannot see that an amendment of this nature should be restricted to certain people in the country. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins has said that some country people do not get their income until the end of the year. That is perfectly true in relation to grain growers and so on, but they do not normally get their money in December anyhow. Many country people have their incomes spread throughout the year, as do many city people. Many city people do not receive their money regularly throughout the year; they may get it half-yearly or annually. I cannot see, if an amendment of this nature is passed, why it should be passed in this form. Consider the dairy farmer: he receives his money regularly, as does the woolgrower, because wool these days is sold throughout the year with, perhaps, a small break at about this time of the year. It is as likely that a man will receive his wool income in April as in December. In other words, this amendment apparently (although on the face of it it appears to be for the benefit of all country people) relates only to some country people. If it is necessary to accept the amendment, I do not see why it should not apply to all people.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I strongly support an amendment in the form suggested by Sir Arthur Rymill. If the Labor Government is genuine about not receiving any extra money from this tax, why is it so reluctant to extend the privilege to all people, so that they can decide whether to take advantage of the privilege or not? In such a case it should not make much difference to the Government whether or not a person elects to pay water rates once a year. I think any resistance on the part of the Government indicates a little bit of dishonesty, because we suspect—

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Mr. Chairman, I object to the word "dishonesty".

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to withdraw the word "dishonesty".

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I withdraw and apologize, Mr. Chairman. Sir Arthur Rymill drew attention to the fact that many city people, big ratepayers, receive a seasonal income. That applies particularly to the nursery trade in which I am interested. All sales are confined to a short period of the year, and nurserymen are some of the larger ratepayers. If the amendment is passed in its present form (as I hope it will be) I foreshadow a further amendment.

The Committee divided on the suggested amendment:

Ayes (9).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins (teller), R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, and C. C. D. Octoman.

Noes (8).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, C. M. Hill, A. F. Kneebone (teller), Sir Lyell McEwin, F. J. Potter, Sir Arthur Rymill, and A. J. Shard.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Suggested amendment thus carried.

Clause 9, with suggested amendment, passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with a suggested amendment.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

That the Bill be recommitted for the consideration of a further amendment to clause 9.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (14).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gifilllan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp (teller), Sir Lyell McEwin, C. C. D. Octoman, F. J. Potter, Sir Arthur Rymill, and C. R. Story.

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

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Bill thus recommitted.

Clause 9—"Time of payment of water rates"—reconsidered.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In view of the difficulty of preparing a further amendment, would it be in order to have the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether the honourable member intends moving in that way or not.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

That progress be reported and the Committee have leave to sit again.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (9).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp (teller), C. C. D. Octoman, and F. J. Potter.

Noes (7).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, C. M. Hill, A. F. Kneebone (teller), Sir Lyell McEwin, Sir Arthur Rymill, and A. J. Shard.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

To amend the Hon. Mr. Dawkins' amendment by striking out "in any case where land is situated within country lands proclaimed as a water district under Part VI of this Act".

One purpose of this amendment is to extend the power of the honourable member's amendment by not restricting it to country districts. Another purpose is to remove the need for anybody to apply to pay in a special way, so that he should have it as a right and not as a privilege explained to him, while under stress, by a public servant. This should make no difference to the monetary yield expected under the Bill. It will mean that a person will not have to disclose the details of his financial position.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: While I sympathize with the motive behind this amendment, which I think straightens out the previous issue, I propose to oppose it because it negates the main purpose of the Bill. It gives the public a tremendous financial advantage. I do not think the Bill was introduced by the Government for the purpose of giving an advantage of this kind. If this amendment was carried, everybody would elect to put off the paying of his rates until the last day of the financial year. That would set back the revenue of the State for over six months, assuming that the money was obtained by the State before December 31, as I understand it is at present. Taxpayers would simply have to elect: they would not have to put up a case for hardship. The acceptance of this amendment would mean that a state of affairs would arise entirely contrary to the main purpose of the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I need hardly say more about the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Kemp: the Hon. Mr. Hill has effectively dealt with it. I think I was most patient in conducting this Bill through this Chamber. On all occasions I tried to meet the requests of honourable members in regard to reporting progress, which I did without any great difficulty for honourable members. When this clause was recommitted Sir Arthur Rymill said that he thought that the concession could apply to other people, because of the date of December 31. I said, too, that there were other people concerned whose annual return from their produce materialized at different times of the year. I said that, if this concession was granted to one group of people, it should reasonably be granted to other people. The honourable, member who has now moved this amendment said, "I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill, and that is the type of amendment I want to move." If we accepted this amendment, it would create such difficulty in the use and programming of the computer that we might have to abandon quarterly payments. This will have to be investigated, because I have not had the opportunity of looking into it. This sort of proposal is not in line with the amendment that the honourable member suggested he would move when the clause was recommitted. He has moved something quite different. I have been patient about this, but now an honourable member jumps up and moves that progress be reported—a totally unheard of thing in this Chamber. Usually an honourable member asks the Minister in charge of the Bill whether he would be willing to report progress. Earlier I had to object to the term

he used in his previous speech. He referred to dishonesty on the part of the Government. Now the honourable member gets up and insults the Minister by moving that progress be reported without even asking the Minister whether he is prepared to report progress. I ask honourable members, in view of this type of action, to oppose the amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thank the Minister for referring to what I said, because his interpretation is perfectly correct. I pointed out in relation to the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that it was restricted to a select proportion of the people of the State; it had no more reference to that, in my view, than to practically the whole of the people of this State. I never for a second suggested that it should be opened out to include all the people in this State, because, if that were done, it would defeat the whole object of the Bill, which is as the Minister has stated. I do not propose to support this amendment any more than I supported the previous amendment because, if the Government wishes to make an amendment of this nature, it is perfectly entitled to do so. Therefore, I have supported the Government on this Bill and will continue to do so.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Hon. Mr. Kemp wish to move his other amendments?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The rest of my amendments were consequential and now have no further significance.

Clause 9, with suggested amendment, passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 10. Page 958.)

Clause 6—"Interpretation."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Mines): I move:

In paragraph (*b*) to strike out "all" and insert "subsurface works and head".

When the Committee sat previously, members raised queries regarding what was meant by "artesian well" and also regarding the meaning of "all works constructed or erected in connection therewith". Progress was reported so that these matters could be examined and I think the amendment clarifies the position. It obviates the rather confusing construction that could have been placed on this clause previously.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This amendment goes practically all the way that honourable members have suggested. It is a great improvement, because people who read the Act will know what it means. I support the amendment.

Th Hon. L. R. HART: I am prepared to accept the amendment submitted by the Minister. I had prepared one along similar lines but, when I proceeded to put it on honourable members' files, I found that the Minister had already placed on the files an amendment that did practically all I required.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I, too, think the amendment is an improvement. The striking out of "all" makes a big difference to the drafting and the clause will now give the Minister all the powers that he requires in the case of a well that overflows, perhaps for only a fortnight in a year, and causes damage nearby.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Directions to owners or occupiers."

The Hon. L. R. HART: This clause amends section 18 of the principal Act and, according to the Minister's statements, section 18 is the section of the Act under which the quantities of water obtained from a bore are controlled. Two points concern me. First, how is the Minister going to regulate the quantities of water that can be taken from a bore? I realize that it may be necessary to introduce a regulation that will permit only a certain amount of water to be pumped from a bore or a well, but what system has the Minister in mind under which this may be carried out? The Minister, in explaining a query that I raised in my second reading speech in reference to the lowering of pumps into wells, said that this would be controlled under section 18.

I assume that the owner of a well or a bore would be required to obtain a permit to lower a pump, but the Minister in his statement said that he would require a licence. I do not think he used the right verbiage. He said that he would require a licence, but he did not say that he would require a permit, but I assume that he would require a permit to lower a pump into an existing well or bore. The other point that worries me is that a person who is a tomato grower or some other kind of grower with a number of glasshouses may suddenly find himself without water, so that there would be a need to lower the pump into the bore. He would have to obtain a permit to do this, and there could possibly be some

considerable delay before this would be granted. In that period he might lose the whole of his crop of tomatoes or whatever he was growing. I consider that this is a good argument in favour of having an advisory committee that could act quickly in a case of this nature, but I should like to hear from the Minister what system he intends to have to control the quantities of water that can be taken from a bore, and, if a permit is required to lower a pump into a bore or well, what period of delay would occur before the necessary permit was granted.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In the circumstances envisaged by the honourable member, it would take the time necessary to ring up the Mines Department and obtain an answer—approximately five minutes. The honourable member says that market gardeners could have glasshouses with a crop of tomatoes, and to keep the tomatoes growing to maturity it would be necessary to deepen a bore for the purpose of getting a continuous supply of water. I submit that, in the circumstances, a permit to deepen the bore would not be immediately refused and that there would not be any delay.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Not to deepen the bore, but to lower the pump into an existing well.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There would not be anything preventing him from doing it, provided that it did not cause any of the things the honourable member enumerated. If it did, an inspection would be made. The purport of this provision is not to go to an individual landholder and say to him, "You have a well X feet deep, but your pump is only at Y feet. You cannot lower that another five or six feet to get a better supply, as you would be pulling out too much water." That is not feasible. I thought the honourable member was suggesting that the person never had the supply and was intending to deepen the well to get a good supply. The intent of the whole of the Bill is to stop undue contamination or exhaustion of the supply generally, not on an individual basis. I cannot see any difficulty in the reference that the honourable member has made.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: He would require a permit.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is only a matter of ringing up and a permit would be given. He might be told that the department would come out later and have a look at it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister has given a logical answer, but I am not too sure that it washes, because clause 7 (*d*) states, "be likely to deplete unduly the supply of underground water". The fact that people are going to drop their pumps by 10 or 12 feet is certainly going to give them an advantage. I understood the Minister to say that this would not be interfered with by the department unless the actual depth of the well was altered. If a person drops the pump down he will be able to pump longer and draw off more water. I do not think that mere ringing up is right. If the Minister is sincere about this, it should be done in writing. The dropping of pumps into bores can make a tremendous difference to depletion of the basin. If a person can run a pump up and down a bore without restriction it will have the same effect as deepening a bore or making a bigger bore hole.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I fully appreciate the honourable member's point. If there were a general application to put pumps down, it would be investigated immediately, but I thought the Hon. Mr. Hart was referring to an individual case and that was how I answered it. There are other matters in relation to clause 18, which refers to "defined areas". These areas would be defined by regulation. If what the Hon. Mr. Story has suggested should happen, certainly the provisions of the Act would be given effect to in relation to a defined area. Before any wholesale lowering of pumps took place, the position would be investigated to see whether or not there was an adequate supply, and to make sure that other supplies would not be depleted and that no contamination would occur. If such conditions were present, permission would not be given. In an individual case I see no hardship at all.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Perhaps I gave the impression that I was dealing with an individual case, but I was not: I was thinking in terms of a specific area where many growers might be involved. I was envisaging a period of hot weather when it would be necessary for the growers to pump an excessive amount of water on to their crops, and in doing so they would tend to lower the basin; they would be involved in a situation where their pumps were not deep enough in the well. In that case, it would be necessary for them to be permitted to lower their pumps in order to save their crops. I am not sure that this permission would be given if the occasion arose. These people want some assurance, not so far in the Bill, that they would be able to save their crops by lowering the pumps in the well. I do not know whether an assurance from the Minister that no grower would be placed in a position where

his crop was in jeopardy through his not being able to increase his water supply would be sufficient, but we need some assurance on that point.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We are now dealing with the whole area. It is not intended to deprive anybody of water. The whole purpose of this provision is to safeguard supplies so that water will be available to everybody. In the circumstances mentioned by the honourable member the supply of water might have to be regulated but it would be ridiculous to say that a man in difficulties with his crop should have no water. If in the whole area people lowered their pumps because they were not getting adequate water supplies, the position would be examined by the Mines Department to see whether a remedy could be effected. Perhaps there would be a restriction on the amount of water to be drawn out at any given time, to ensure that all the growers in the area had sufficient water to keep their crops growing. That is the purpose of the Bill. To try to ensure ample water for every grower for this, that and the other purpose would be almost impossible.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Artesian wells to be capped."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I move:

After "offence" first occurring to insert the following new subsection:

(3) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any artesian well from which water flows only periodically unless the Minister so directs. The Minister shall not so direct unless he is satisfied that the provisions of this section should in the public interest apply to any such well.

This amendment is a further safeguard. It is believed by the Government that the Minister, irrespective of who he may be, should have some powers in this matter. I recall one instance where considerable damage was done to a property by the unrestricted flowing of an artesian bore. The people concerned said they had no use for the bore. The amendment would allow the Minister to say to the owners of such a bore, "This bore has to be capped." The Hon. Mr. DeGaris mentioned what can and does happen in the South-East, where the water table will rise considerably in wet weather, flow for a period and then, as it subsides, the flow stops and it is necessary to pump. In those circumstances, people would not be required to cap their wells or bores. The Government should have the power to say, "Because of the considerable damage that this bore can cause, you will have to cap it." This amendment would meet objections raised to the interpretation of "artesian well", in clause 6.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I support the amendment. When this matter was first raised, we had some difficulty in altering the definition of "artesian well" in clause 6. An alteration has been made, and now a further subsection is to be added, covering the difficulties raised about that definition. I appreciate that the Minister should have power to have capped wells that may not flow for 12 months of the year. There may not be many of them, but no doubt there are some wells that flow periodically that should not be left uncapped for even a short period. The amendment covers my original objection to the definition of "artesian well" and I support it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 12—"Repeal and re-enactment of Part III of principal Act."

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

To strike out "The heading immediately preceding section 21 of the principal Act and sections 21, 22 and 23 of the principal Act are repealed and".

The effect of this amendment will be to leave the position as it is at present. I wish the Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination to be retained. In his second reading explanation the Minister said it was desired to abolish it because the department was, in effect, the advisory committee and that the laymen involved were not able to keep up with the technical information that was available to the Minister's officers through their knowledge of hydraulics and other things. Although this may be true, the lay mind often probes deeper than does the expert mind, and I believe that these people would be of assistance not only to the advisory committee but also to the Minister. When this legislation was before this Chamber in 1959 honourable members thought it necessary that there be some people other than officers of the department on the committee, as they considered that the 1957 legislation was a little stringent.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The advisory committee deals with highly technical matters that are within the knowledge of the officers of the Mines Department, so these people are really only advising themselves. I do not want it to be thought that I am reflecting on other members of the committee, but their knowledge of these matters is limited. It is not necessary to retain the committee.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I support the amendment. I appreciate that the advice of

highly trained technical people is necessary, but I subscribe to the contention that lay people can be of inestimable value to such a committee. Although laymen may not have the technical training or the ideas and standards of technical people, they often have a wider experience and a more intimate knowledge of the conditions in the area where problems arise than perhaps technical officers have. The amendment will retain the committee, not only for the benefit of the department but also for the benefit of the Minister.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I support the amendment, which provides for the retention of the advisory committee. The value of the committee has not been tested, because the legislation has not been proclaimed. However, this is a contentious matter and, doubtless, there will be opposition to it. Because of that, the Act may be more acceptable if there is an advisory committee on which there is a person with local knowledge.

Similar legislation introduced in Tasmania provided for an advisory committee, which shall consist of such persons as the Minister considers suitable and shall include an officer of the Department of Mines, an officer of the Department of Health Services and a member or officer of the Rivers and Water Supply Commission. In addition, the Minister may appoint a person to be a member of the committee for the purpose of the consideration of any particular matter and where the Minister is of opinion that that matter particularly affects any authority or body or class of person, the person may be so appointed on the nomination of the authority or body or any organization or association or any body who, in the Minister's opinion, represents that authority or body or class of person. I think that is the type of advisory committee that we envisage and I suggest that such a committee could be helpful to the Minister and acceptable to the people who will be affected by the legislation.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

To strike out "in lieu" and insert "immediately after section 23"; to strike out "III" and insert "IIIA"; and in new section 21 to strike out "21" and insert "23a".

Amendments carried.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It will be necessary to renumber sections 22 to 23f accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall do that.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 13—"The appeal board."

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

To strike out "four" and insert "six".

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I oppose the amendment. The clause deals with the operation of the appeal board, and the members of the board are provided for. The Bill increases the number of members from three to four by providing for a member of the Licensed Well Drillers Association to have a representative on the board to deal with appeals lodged from time to time. To increase the number of members from three to six is to increase the membership by 100 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. Story: My amendment provides for only two additional members.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not know what the honourable member has in mind about the two additional members, but I do not see the necessity for an appeal board consisting of six members.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Why have you provided for four?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: So that the Licensed Well Drillers Association will be able to nominate a member of the board. I do not see any need for further additions.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Can you say why the drillers are to have a representative?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We expect the drillers to play an important part and we consider they should have a representative on the board, because a contractor may appeal against a decision made under the Act. To enable adequate representation it is vital to have a representative on the board to ensure that a case has been adequately dealt with. I do not see any necessity to extend the membership of the appeal board any further than that. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister cannot get me in like that. He knows as well as I do that they are putting in six because he is is represented, too. We are going to increase the appeal board in a subsequent amendment, if we can, so as to get some representation for the people who are vitally involved—the people who pay the bill. The Minister was on much stronger ground when he was talking about the advisory body, but now he is on the appeal board. By his amendment, we bring on to the appeal board a new representative of people called the Licensed Well Drillers Association. We are making provision in a subsequent clause to include two categories of people at present listed in the advisory committee, which we want to bring back, and this is something we should have had right from the word "go". They are:

A person to be nominated by the Council or Councils of the local governing area or areas affected by any question referred by the Minister under this Part; and such other persons,

one of whom shall be a landowner, as the Minister considers necessary.

This is very important; we need some person, who has local knowledge, as a person whom the Minister would appoint. In the great artesian area there is no local government body at all. The Minister has certain people whom he and his colleagues appoint to other boards—the Vermin Fences Board and the Noxious Weeds Board—responsible persons with great local knowledge, and I consider that an appeal board set up very circumspectly, as set out in the principal Act at the moment, is not in the best interests of those concerned.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am afraid that I do not quite understand the object of this amendment. The Hon. Mr. Story has given us some explanation of it. His idea is apparently to increase the number on the board from four to six by the appointment of a local government representative and a landowner, but the appeal board, as I understand it, will be sitting on appeals from any part of the State, and a representative of local government can only be interested, under the foreshadowed amendment, in one particular part of the State. The board would only have such a member in respect of a limited portion of the State, and the landowner might be from a totally different area from that affected. I cannot quite see how the addition of two extra members of this nature could give the kind of representation that Mr. Story suggested that it ought to have.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I would support the amendment because, as I said at an earlier stage in the debate, I consider that the appeal board should consist of more people and that industry itself should be represented. I also support the suggestion that someone nominated by, but not necessarily from, the local council who would officiate in his own area should be on the appeal board.

I notice that the Minister has said something about such a board being unwieldy. I ask the Minister to reconsider this, as I believe it is necessary and advisable. If it is necessary to have someone from the Licensed Well Drillers Association, it is necessary to have someone from the industry and also someone from the district who knows it very well. I suggest to the Minister that the word "unwieldy" does not apply to a board of six people, and I ask him to reconsider the proposition.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I would support an amendment to clause 13, and I think there is very good reason why the scope of the appeal board should be broadened. We are not in a position to know whether the previous appeal board was sufficient or not, because, as I have said previously on another clause in this Bill, it has never come into operation or been tested. The Minister would appreciate that the whole scope of this Act has been broadened; previously it dealt only with contamination of underground waters, but at the present time it has to cover the supply of underground waters and, therefore, there are very good reasons why it should be broadened.

I also support the submissions of Sir Arthur Rymill. Perhaps we could come to a compromise with the Minister in having an appeal board of five rather than six. If this is carried to its ultimate conclusion, there will be some elasticity, in that the same persons will not serve on the board over the whole period of its operation. The representative of local government will change according to the area where the Act will apply. It could be so worded that, where the Act was to apply to an area where local government was not in existence, then his place could be taken by some other person nominated by an appropriate body in that particular area. I feel sure that the Minister will agree that this is a reasonable compromise. It would be reasonable to expect that, where the artesian areas were concerned (which, in most cases, are areas outside the local government areas) the person experienced in pastoral pursuits would be appropriate to be on the appeal board; but, where the Act applied in the inner areas, a person sponsored by local government would then be appropriate. I support the amendment as it stands at this stage but would be prepared to compromise and have "five" instead of "six" inserted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I support this amendment. I was hoping for more information from the Minister, because he was proposing an increase from three to four in the personnel of the board. The question was why it was being raised from three to four, and the answer was that they were people who were interested in the particular problem. As regards the extra member of the board, he will represent licensed drillers whose interests are confined to carrying out the work expected of a tradesman. In other parts of the Bill we find that the landowner is vitally concerned. Somebody completely dissociated from primary industry is going to be on the board, but the man who has to pay for something going wrong with his water supply is not represented. There is a case for having a representative of the landowners on the board.

After all, a landowner is a landowner all over South Australia. There would be no trouble in getting a representative to look after his interests.

Another nomination comes from the district councils. In 1959 Parliament provided for a person nominated by a district council to be on the advisory committee, provided he represented the council in whichever district a matter was being considered. That is not completely without precedent. We have appeals to the Land Board against assessments, where representatives from the South-East do not concern themselves with an appeal from, say, the Far North. A representative elected by a district council should have the public interest at heart, as distinct from that of the landowner. I think a similar provision would improve the board. I cannot understand why the Minister is prepared to increase the members of the board by accepting a representative of a sectional interest, and excluding others who have a greater interest in what is happening than those on the board have. I hope the Minister will accept this amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I believe the Hon. Mr. Story in designing the total effect of this amendment has followed somewhat the provisions of section 21 of the principal Act relating to the Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination, which has at least six members. Paragraph (*e*) deals with a person to be nominated by the district council, and paragraph (*f*) provides for other members, one of whom shall be a landholder. This amendment for the purpose of increasing the membership of the appeal board from four to six is intended, by the foreshadowed further amendment, to include the same sort of people as referred to in paragraphs (*e*) and (*f*) of section 21 relating to the advisory committee. There is a fundamental difference between these two boards or committees, in as much as under section 21 "the members of the advisory committee shall hold office during the pleasure of the Minister". Thus, it is a simple procedure for the Minister to appoint a new representative of local government each time he has a question before him relating to a different part of the State, but the appeal board is of an entirely different construction, of a much more permanent nature, because section 26 of the Act states:

> Subject to this Act every member of the appeal board shall be entitled to hold office as such until the thirtieth day of June, in the fourth year after the year in which he was appointed.

So in the one case the appointment is during the pleasure of the Minister and in the other case it is for a period of something approximating four years. It would be easy enough to substitute any person from local government and a landowner from any part of the State relevant to the particular question before the advisory committee; but, where there is a four-year appointment, without some consequential amendments to this clause or without the complete alteration of the constitution of the appeal board, making it a board appointed from time to time instead of a permanent board, I do not think that the intention of these amendments, admirable though it may be, lines up with the nature of this appointment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I thank Sir Arthur for the interesting point he has raised, but I am still firmly convinced that it is desirable that we should have a person "nominated by the council or councils of the local governing area or areas affected by any question referred by the Minister". If it is necessary to have consequential amendments to it, we shall have to have them. This is a sensible approach to the matter. I do not see how we shall get the effect if we do not have this person available to be called upon. No doubt there are ways to overcome this problem. Perhaps it can be done on a regional basis.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I think it can be overcome, but important amendments to the whole structure of the clause must be made before it can be done.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Knowing the generosity of the Minister, I have no doubt that he will allow me time to draft these amendments. If this amendment is carried, when we reach the clause that contains the part that has been mentioned we shall be able to deal with the matter mentioned by honourable members.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I still oppose the amendment. It would be much better to move to delete clause 14, which is no longer necessary. If necessary, I will move that.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister will have to deal with clause 13 first.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Because of the doubt in honourable members' minds about the amendment, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 10. Page 959.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): This Bill obviously arises out of one of the Government's election promises as declared by the Premier during his policy

speech. It is part of the Government's stated policy and, as honourable members know, I have said from the start of this session that I will not oppose the Government's stated policy unless I have very good reasons for doing so, in which event I will state my reasons. In his policy speech, the Premier said:

As I promised a review of superannuation three years ago, I give you now a definite assurance that superannuation will be completely overhauled and provide benefits equal to other States and the Commonwealth, with a further provision that persons who desire to retire earlier than the normal retiring age of 60 years for females and 65 for males may do so provided that they pay an amount equal to their normal contributions had they not sought early retirement. Any exemptions that already apply for early retirement will continue. These provisions apply in the other States and the Commonwealth; consequently, they should apply in this State.

I believe this Bill is a fair representation of that election promise. In the circumstances I have no reason for opposing it, and I therefore propose to support the second reading. However, I should like to make certain comments on the Bill and ask the Minister whether he will give me further information that I believe is important for a full consideration of the matter. As was stated in the policy speech, in most other States this provision applies. I think in his second reading explanation the Minister did not claim that it applied in all States: I think he said it applied in most other States, or something of that nature.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I said that it applied in the majority of the States.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I accept that. A provision of this nature is already quite usual in private business superannuation schemes. In some of these schemes certain consents of the directorate are required for an early retirement, and in others there is an absolute right to the employee to determine that he wants to retire at a particular earlier age, as is given public servants in this Bill. I am familiar with many of these schemes; indeed, I have promoted one or two and have been instrumental in having additional benefits added to certain of them, because I am a believer in superannuation and in reasonable conditions applying to it.

It seems rather paradoxical, however, that in these days, when medical science has advanced the length of the normal human life and with the normal health of the human being so much improved, we should be talking about earlier and earlier retirement. I know that this aligns with certain political concepts that people should be given the benefit of scientific advancement in the way of machinery and that sort of thing and that this is one way that they can be allowed to enjoy life more and not have to work so hard. I am not querying this: I am merely drawing attention to the fact that there is another school of thought that, the trend being towards a longer life and a healthier human being, it is consistent with ordinary sense that the age of retirement should at least remain constant if not be capable of being increased.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But don't you think that the majority of people who will retire under this Bill will be those forced to do so because of ill health? That is the main purpose.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think so, and I hope so. If this is so, this Bill is a very laudable measure.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think this is the main thought behind it.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think so, but it is drafted in wider language, as it gives any male public servant power to elect to retire at 60, and the election can be made at any time. This is a flexible Bill. The election can be made before the man reaches 60 or, apparently, he can elect after reaching 60 to retire. In these circumstances, certain adjustments to his contribution are made so that he will pay what other people contribute towards their pensions. This adjustment will be calculated actuarially. It is not the sort of calculation that most of us could do readily, because the person who retires at 60 will in normality enjoy the pension for five years longer than the person who retires at 65. It is not just a matter of saying, "You pay the contribution for the next five years and you will be all right." As I see it, it will be a much more complicated mathematical problem, and the legislation provides for these calculations to be made.

I do not think it would be a good thing for any country to have a large part of its work force idle for years before it needed to be. Some people look forward to retirement and others want to work as long as they possibly can: it is a matter of outlook. I again express the hope that people will not exercise this option unless it is necessary for them to do so on medical or similar grounds. It seems that the Government looks at the matter in the same way.

This is not an easy subject to follow, because both the Public Service Act and the Superannuation Act come into the consideration. Section 41 of the Superannuation Act suggests that at present there is some right for a person to retire before reaching the age of 65, because part of the section provides:

Provided that any contributor who, being a man, has attained the age of sixty years, or, being a woman, has attained the age of fifty-five years—

They are the same ages as are provided for in this Bill. The section goes on:

. . . and elects to retire before attaining the age of retirement, shall . . . be entitled to the pension which is the actuarial equivalent of contributions made . . .

Apparently, there is at present some right of retirement at the ages mentioned in this Bill but, of course, a person exercising that right does not get the benefits of this measure.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is a procedure for Executive Council to deal with them. There have been many such retirements on medical grounds.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: They have a clear right to retire if they wish to, but they take a lower pension.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am grateful for the interjections. I have done much work on the Bill, because the subject is somewhat new to me, but I cannot find in the Public Service Act any actual right of retirement before the age referred to, which is 65 in the case of males. Section 57 of the Public Service Act refers to the fact that every officer shall retire at the age of 65 years in the case of a male officer and 60 years in the case of a female officer. It goes on to permit the Governor to extend that period. It may be that, by a provision somewhere in the Act, the period can be diminished. If that is specifically provided for, the research that I have been able to do has not discovered it.

It seems, whether I am right or wrong, that the Bill will enable a man or a woman to retire on full pension five years earlier than is at present provided if the person concerned makes the additional payments that the actuary decides are proper. If a person elected at an early time in his career to retire at the age of 60, his contributions, although they would be higher than those made by a person retiring at 65, would be spread over a considerable period.

I should like the Minister, when he replies, to clarify whether there can be an intermediate retiring age between the respective ages of 55 and 60 in the case of women and between the ages of 60 and 65 in the case of men. This Bill refers to retirement at 60 or 65 in the case of men but it does not, in express terms, apply to retirement at any other age. In other words, on a literal reading of the Bill, one would assume that male officers will have the option of retiring at 60 or 65, but not at any other age. Clause 6, which enacts new section 75d, provides:

(4) Where an employee who has made an election under the provisions of subsection (1) or subsection (2) of this section retires not less than one year after attaining the age of sixty years or fifty-five years if a female, there shall be paid to him out of the Fund . . .

Although the Bill provides that a man can retire at 60 or 65, it seems to be in contemplation that a person can retire at any age between those ages. I should like the Minister to explain that and to tell me how it can be done, because there seems to be sense in the idea that, if a person is allowed to retire at 60 or 65, possibly he ought to be allowed to retire at some interim period between those ages. An important aspect of this will be the cost to the State Government, which, as honourable members know, subsidizes substantially the contributions of public servants to the Superannuation Fund. This is in line with what private business does and, as I read it, it is on much the same basis, but the amount in which the State Government is involved is fairly substantial.

I find that in 1964-65 the Government's contribution to the fund was more than $3,000,000. It has been increasing gradually. In the previous year I think it was slightly less than £1,500,000, that being the currency at that time. I should like the Minister to also tell us, because he has not yet done so, the annual estimated cost to the Government, not only for the first year of operation but also in future years, because it seems to me that this will be a steadily increasing amount and that it will be substantial. I know that this will depend on the number of members who elect to retire at the earlier age and that not all members who are going to retire at the earlier age will elect at once to do so.

Nevertheless, an estimate can be made in these matters. Private business does this accurately today, even where certain intangibles have to be brought into the equation, and I know that the Government can do it. I do not know whether the Government has already made such an estimate. I believe that when it fulfilled its service pay promise it had no idea what it would cost. The cost was such a substantial amount that it has placed the

Government in a position of financial embarrassment. It was a fairly expensive policy speech by the present Premier. It provided for service pay, for additional superannuation in the way of this voluntary election, and for other things. We should be told, when asked to pass a Bill of this sort, how much the estimated annual cost to the Government will be. This is a vital matter and one doubts that the extra money needed by the Government will be easy to find. However, I shall not dwell on that.

The Bill is in two parts. The second part relates to temporary positions and provides that additional superannuation may be taken out if the applicant satisfies the board that his salary is likely to be more than of a temporary nature. I should like the Minister, when replying, to explain whether he is satisfied that clause 5b, as drawn, achieves that result. I have tried to put it together with the Superannuation Act. It is an amendment to the definition of ''salary'' in section 3 of the principal Act, but there seems to me to be some doubt as to whether the amendment achieves what has been claimed for it. Reading the salient words of that definition, as amended by this Bill, ''salary'' means salary or wages, and includes certain things, but does not include payments of a temporary character, bonuses and so on. The second reading explanation claimed that if the employee could satisfy the board that his increased salary was likely to be other than temporary, he could contribute for increased superannuation.

I am a little dubious as to whether that is the construction to be placed on these words, but if the Minister has a look at it no doubt he will be able to enlighten me on the matter. I am completely happy about the Bill where the applicant feels it is necessary to retire at 60 because of medical or other reasons, but I am not enthusiastic about retirement for people who are hale and hearty. I imagine that it would be difficult to draw a Bill that provided that only people who could produce medical certificates could retire at 60. It would be difficult to say who should and who should not retire, and that is no doubt the reason why the Government has chosen to submit the Bill in this form. On my observations, many men these days are in the full flight of their ability and experience between 60 and 65.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have some here.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: As the Minister mentioned, we have examples of it in this august Chamber. We only have to look around our excellent Public Service to see outstanding examples, such as Sir Fred Drew, who retired a few years ago and is still very active in his work and doing great deeds for various other people, and Mr. Julian Dridan who, I regret to hear, is retiring this year—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He won't stop working.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: They will be a tremendous loss to the Public Service; they have been completely outstanding public servants. I am not naming them to the exclusion of others, as there are many others as well. It would have been a tragedy for the State if these men had elected to retire at 60. I do not think they would have done so. It would have been a great loss to the State. I conclude by expressing the hope that only those who really need it will elect for an early retirement. I hope the Minister will give me answers to my questions.

Finally, I suggest that it is about time the whole Act was reprinted after this amendment goes through. There have been many amendments to it, and it is such a patchwork quilt now that it is hard to follow it through without going into many annual volumes. It was due for reprinting some time ago, and I recommend that the work be done as soon as possible. All Statutes are to be reprinted, but that will be a lengthy job. Many people will have to work on this Act before a general consolidation comes about in four or five years' time. It will be well worth while reprinting the Superannuation Act sooner.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.56 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 17, at 2.15 p.m.