

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, August 18, 1954.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY.**

The PRESIDENT—His Excellency the Governor having fixed 2.15 p.m. as the time for receiving the Address in Reply, I ask the mover and seconder and other members to accompany me to Government House to present it.

The President and honourable members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.20 p.m.

The PRESIDENT—I have to report that, accompanied by honourable members, I attended at Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply that was adopted by the Legislative Council on July 29. His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:—

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament on June 3 of this year. I am confident that you will give full and careful attention to all matters placed before you and I pray that God's blessing may crown your labours.

**QUESTIONS.****TRAFFIC ARCHIPELAGOES.**

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—As the Government has referred the question of the building of various traffic archipelagoes around the city so as to confuse and trouble traffic to the State Traffic Committee, will it take steps to see that no permanent archipelagoes are erected until the committee's report has been considered by Parliament?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The matter is before the State Traffic Committee and when its report is received no doubt it will be considered by Cabinet. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister concerned.

**EMPLOYMENT OF PRIVATE ARCHITECTS.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Can the Chief Secretary say what progress has been made in negotiations for the employment of private architects in the building of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—As I have previously informed members, the Government has for some time been investigating the question of obtaining architectural assistance from private architects in order to expedite the

completion of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Early in July a series of conferences were held by Ministers with Mr. Caradoc Ashton, of the firm of Caradoc Ashton, Fisher, Woodhead & Beaumont-Smith, and the Architect-in-Chief. Discussions also took place with representatives of the firm of Stephenson & Turner, architects of Melbourne, who are recognized as the leading hospital architects in Australia. I am pleased to announce that finality has now been reached and Messrs. Stephenson & Turner, and Messrs. Caradoc Ashton, Fisher, Woodhead & Beaumont-Smith have been appointed joint architects to provide full architectural services for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in respect of

1. Medical and surgical block.
2. Laundry block—including steam ducting.
3. Resident medical officers' quarters.
4. Kiosk.
5. One or more houses for resident superintendents.
6. Completion of nurses' home.
7. Completion of site work beyond contracts already let.

It is the Government's desire that Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, will be completed simultaneously with the maternity block, which it is anticipated will be ready for occupation in two years. The completion of the maternity block, the boiler house, boiler installation and workshops will continue to be the responsibility of the Architect-in-Chief.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In 1939, following the outbreak of war, the Commonwealth Government sought the aid of various architects' institutes throughout Australia to set up an architectural panel whereby urgent Government work could be completed. I now ask whether this Government has considered the possibility of asking the South Australian Institute of Architects to set up a panel to carry out work urgently necessary, and hand out work to practising architects?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—As I indicated in a reply to the honourable member yesterday, the Premier has communicated with the Institute of Architects, which spoke with several voices a week or two ago and has made certain suggestions to the press. Later a letter was received from the president, to which the Premier replied and asked the architects themselves to appoint the principals who were to take charge of the respective spare parts that were available from several firms. As no

reply has been received there is nothing before the Government for consideration at the moment. It is generally agreed that hospital planning is specialized work. A couple of months ago, in seeking assistance, the Government naturally turned to those who had specialized in that particular type of work, and I am pleased to say that those negotiations have been successful. It will provide considerable relief to the Architect-in-Chief's Department. The Government is ready to consider any practical proposal to assist if it should find itself still in need of outside assistance.

#### AVAILABILITY OF BILLS.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Honourable members have always desired, and generally their wishes have been met, that they should have before them copies of Bills before the second reading speech is given. I realize that the Government Printing Office has difficulties, but yesterday on three occasions the Chamber generously agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders to permit second reading speeches on Bills of which members had no knowledge. They had not seen them, nor did they see them until about 11.45 a.m. today. I feel that this is not in the interests of the working of the House, and I therefore ask the Chief Secretary whether in future he will endeavour to so arrange the business that second reading speeches will not be given until members have copies of the Bills.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The obvious answer is that I have always had consideration for members and the working of the House, otherwise I am sure that it would not have agreed to what has been done. I have not broken any of the Standing Orders, and where necessary suspensions have been granted with a view to assisting the Council. Some Bills have not been available because of the difficulties at the Government Printing Office, which has lost practically one-third of its compositors. As usual, the Leader of the Opposition, who is always out to assist and push on with the work of the Council, was prepared to proceed with his speeches on those Bills today. However, if he desires to change his mind, he can do so. I have never asked any member to proceed with a Bill unless he is prepared to do so. I have appealed to members to assist only when they have had what I have thought to be ample time to consider legislation, and I have never asked the House to do anything

contrary to the desires of members. I appreciate what the House did yesterday in allowing me to introduce Bills, and nobody was at a disadvantage. If I had asked the House to proceed with them it might have been a different matter. The information was made available so that when the members got the Bills they could study them. As members know, new Bills are not printed until they are brought before the House. I think the honourable member was rather straining the matter when he brought forward the question in such a way.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: MARGARINE INDUSTRY.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I move:—

That the Council at its rising adjourn until 1.45 p.m. on Thursday, August 19, in order to discuss a matter of urgency, namely, the closing down of margarine factories and the detrimental effect on consumers and employees in the industry. On several occasions I have referred to the serious position of the flour export trade, but so far without achieving success. The milling industry manufactured in 1951-52 nearly 2,500,000 tons of flour, bran and pollard and was one of the largest manufacturers in the Commonwealth. Further running time has been reduced since I last addressed myself to this question and the industry is now in a worse position. Today I refer to another industry of a smaller type with a plea that the Government will be reasonable and do something to help employees and consumers. I approach this question without any antagonism or feeling towards the Government, but only with a desire to state the facts for the margarine industry. I do so because the Government is always advertising what it is doing for the industry. In this case its policy is wrong because it is doing the direct opposite.

In 1952 when introducing a Bill to increase the quota of margarine I said I was strongly of the opinion that it would not interfere in any way with the dairying industry. What I said has proved to be true as statistics show that my contention was supported by two Ministers of Agriculture in other States, not of Labor faith, who were primary producers. I received a good measure of support from members here for my Bill which was to increase the quota by 100 per cent (312 tons annually to 624). The Government moved an amendment to limit the increase to 50 per cent and

this was carried. At the time, although accepting the amendment, I said I would agree to the decision for the time being. If the Bill had been carried as introduced I would not be ventilating this injustice today. I was approached some time ago and informed that, in spite of rationing, the quota allowed by Parliament to be manufactured would be reached by the first week in August. I interviewed the Premier requesting that it should be increased, as otherwise the South Australian market would be flooded by interstate margarine to the detriment of the local manufacturers, who would be forced to close their factories. That has actually happened. He said he would submit my request to Cabinet, but later I was informed that the Government would not take any action. I then inquired what the Government would do when manufacturing ceased in South Australia and the market was flooded by interstate margarine, as the South-East and other parts of the State were flooded before the last increase was granted. In the reply it was stated that the Government would look at the position then. When the quota was reached I interviewed the Premier. I wrote to him on August 5 and will read the letter and the reply thereto. My letter was as follows:—

Following on my previous interviews regarding legislation to increase the quota of margarine to both firms operating in South Australia, I respectfully make a further request for consideration. The firms concerned in the sale of this commodity have manufactured the amounts allowed under their quota and, as they cannot exceed their quotas, they now have no alternative but to close down and dismiss a number of employees. In order to deal fairly with retailers they have rationed supplies but despite this have repeatedly had to refuse orders, showing that the demand for the commodity far exceeds the quotas manufactured. It is reported to me that a new agency has been opened at Broken Hill and it is expected that the South Australian market will be flooded with interstate margarine to the detriment of the local manufacturers. With the information submitted to you previously and in the light of the anticipated threat to local manufacturers I appeal for your further consideration in order to meet requirements, protect the industry's employees and assist the housewife in balancing her budget. I would also like to know whether anything can be done to meet the immediate position by increasing the quota.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Don't these manufacturers increase their quotas under permit for export?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, they can only manufacture a certain amount, which they have done despite the fact that they had to ration it.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Don't manufacturers in other States have to obtain quotas to import oils. How is it that they have this surplus to send to South Australia?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Quotas in other States have been increased considerably. The Premier's reply dated August 11 reads:—

With reference to your letter of the 5th instant I desire to inform you that it is not the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to amend the Margarine Act to provide for an increase in the quota of margarine which may be manufactured and sold annually in South Australia. This decision was confirmed in Cabinet last Monday when your letter was further taken into consideration.

I am duty bound to those I represent to place this matter before members. I could introduce a Bill as I did a couple of years ago, but I will not do that because I am convinced that the Government will be reasonable enough to give further consideration to the matter, but if it does not do so I have to accept that position.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—Is that a threat?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, if I wanted to use threats I could do so in many ways. The position today is that no more table margarine is being manufactured, despite the fact that the manufacturers have done everything reasonably possible to ration the quota. This I can substantiate because I have read the correspondence received from a number of business houses and stores in the city and country. We cannot prevent the importation of margarine from other States. If that could be done there might be something in the argument that the Government wants to protect an industry in this State, but if margarine is to be consumed here why should not the local manufacturers have the opportunity of producing it?

The Hon. N. L. Jude—What about the importing of oils by other States?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is a Federal matter, so let the Minister convince the Commonwealth authorities they should do that. Why should we prevent the consumer from purchasing a cheaper article for which there is a strong demand?

The Hon. L. H. Densley—How is the consumer being prevented? You are trying to have it both ways, and you cannot do that.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am not; I am trying to protect the South Australian manufacturers, as I have always tried to do.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Are the other States sending margarine here today?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—They are not because at present it can be obtained locally. Although we can prevent the manufacturing of an article here we cannot prevent its importation from another State. I challenge any member to indicate how the Government has treated any other industry like this one. The Government's action is penalizing the consumer, particularly the man in the lower income group and old age pensioners.

In the *Advertiser* of August 3 (page 3) the following appeared:—

Retail sales of goods in the quarter ended June 30, 1954, was 6.3 per cent above those of the corresponding quarter in 1953. They were 7 per cent higher than the March quarter of this year.

With wages pegged and increased margins refused we find that the people are not able to purchase local margarine at 2s. 7½d. a pound, but legislation endeavours to compel them to purchase butter at 4s. 1½d. a pound, which is beyond the means of a large number of people. There are other commodities in competition with butter, but no attempt is made to control them. I know of no other commodity which is subject to this treatment and where people are prevented from purchasing an article which is in strong demand. To prevent the manufacturer from producing a necessity which has been on the market for many years is unfair and unjust.

The consumer today is helping the dairy industry and I do not think anyone objects, because everyone appreciates its importance, but there are other sections of the community also entitled to consideration. In my own case my household consumes three pounds of butter a week. The London parity price is 3s. 6d. a pound, which is what the British consumer pays or that is the value to the Australian producer. We pay 4s. 1½d. a pound, which includes a subsidy of 7½d. a pound. This means that my personal contribution to the dairy industry is £4 17s. 6d. a year. The consumer with a larger family pays more and the old age pensioner a smaller sum. The primary producer is also assisted by a stabilized price of wheat of 14s. a bushel, to which I do not object. The people had no objection to the recent penny a loaf increase in the price of bread brought about by increasing the price of wheat from 12s. 7d. to 14s. a bushel because they felt that the industry was entitled to this, but others should be considered. For instance, the basic wage earner with a large family would consume four loaves a day and this represents an annual contribution of £6 2s. and a pensioner would probably contribute about £1 17s. 6d. Is

not the consumer entitled to purchase margarine locally at 2s. 7½d.? The following table shows the quotas in the various States as at July 21, 1954:—

	Tons.	Lb. per capita.
New South Wales	2,500	1.62
Queensland . . .	4,236	7.51
Victoria . . . .	1,196	1.12
Tasmania . . . .	208	1.51
South Australia .	468	1.38
Western Australia	600	2.19 }
In reserve . . . .	200	.73 } 2.92
Total for Australia	9,408	2.29 (avg.)

Something was said by way of interjection about population, but on those figures, possibly with the exception of Victoria, ours is the lowest per capita consumption in Australia. Much has been said concerning the position of the man on the land and consequently I feel justified in quoting an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* on May 11, 1954, as follows:—

Concern at rising land prices in Australia was expressed by the Premier yesterday when he spoke at the opening of the annual conference of the Milk Producers Association of Australasia. He said that the trend here was not in keeping with land prices in the rest of the world. Because the producer paid a high price for land, as was happening in Australia now, it would not be fair for the consumer of primary products to be charged more. He said that producers would burn their fingers if they were depending upon borrowed money to pay for land. Mr. Playford asked the conference to consider the point that prices chasing land values would cut Australia out of world markets and even our traditional markets such as Singapore.

They were the Premier's words, not mine. Again, in the *Advertiser* of May 11, 1954, this also appeared:—

Land values in some parts of South Australia had risen by more than 300 per cent since price control was lifted in 1948 a spokesman for a leading stock firm said yesterday when commenting on the Premier's speech. He added that an acre of land at Jamestown in 1948 was hard to sell at £10 but now it brought at least £30. Land at Two Wells cost more than £40 an acre and was nearer £50 an acre at Tarlee and Riverton.

If an industry is in the state we are led to believe it is in why have high prices been paid for land? This is an aspect of great importance. On the question of butter prices the following figures are taken from the *Mail* of June 28, 1952:—Producers' price in 1947—11½d. a lb; in 1952, 2s. 5d. Subsidy in 1947, 4d. and in 1952, 10d. My point is that we are prepared to pay these subsidies to industries that are thriving. Will anyone deny that the farming industry is in a better position

today than it has ever been? Yet we are subsidizing it. While we are spending millions in subsidies to these industries we say to the local manufacturer of margarine that he cannot exceed his quota. Wages are pegged, the court will not permit an increase in margins; we are keeping everyone down to a level and we are saying to the consumer that he may not purchase an article that is in demand and gives satisfaction to thousands of people.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—How many does this industry employ?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is not the question; it is one of principle. How many consumers of margarine are there in South Australia? They are the people to be considered, and in considering them we are considering the employees too. Let me ask again whether any member can tell me of one other industry that Parliament prevents from making more of its product? As a Parliament we deny people the right to buy this commodity unless they get it from another State. I have here a full page advertisement inserted by an interstate firm in a paper published in another State. The people in the eastern States have to pay a higher price than those in South Australia, so why penalize the local industry? From day to day we read in the newspapers that the Government is finding new industries for South Australia, for which I commend it, but that does not justify our doing anything detrimental to a small industry while the public is demanding its product.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What is the volume of unsatisfied demand for this commodity?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We fixed the 1953-54 quota at 468 tons. The manufacturers naturally desired to spread that over the 12 months, but the demand has been such that by the end of July they had manufactured the full quota without satisfying the demand, and are now compelled to close down for five months.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Do you think that a lot of margarine is sold as butter in cafes and restaurants?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I think quite a lot is sold in ice-cream, on which we pay a subsidy, and perhaps in one or two other little things.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It would not affect the market or anyone else, would it?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is the whole point. The Department of Agriculture knows, as well as I do, that prior to the introduction of the Bill in 1952 margarine came in to the South-East from other States, and it will do so again. I ask any member how he

would like to see his place of business closed while a competitor in another State was sending his product here? That is one of my strongest points. In my opinion we could grant an increase in the margarine quota without in any way interfering with the dairy industry.

I have perused a number of letters from reputable firms asking for further supplies of margarine, only to be told that there is none available. I have some in my possession which members may see—three from Renmark, others from Berri, Moonta, Angaston, Quorn, Georgetown, and Crystal Brook, another is from Bakery Specialists, Port Pirie, and states, *inter alia*, "Will you please forward remaining stocks of margarine held by you? To sum up, I express the opinion that the increase in the quota of margarine would not affect the dairy industry for the reasons I have stated. Why should consumers not be able to purchase a cheaper commodity from local manufacturer? The closing down of manufacture in South Australia will not prevent the flooding of the market from other States and South Australian manufacturers should not be placed at this disadvantage.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Can the honourable member say what proportion is coming into South Australia?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Not now because the manufacturer has met the demand until just recently, but the moment he cannot meet it it will come in. My friend knows as well as I do that is the case. Why else has an agency been opened in Broken Hill? If it can be shown that limitation of production will protect the dairy industry I am prepared to listen, but I am not convinced that it cannot be done in that way. In these times when we talk about balancing the Budget and stabilizing economy, when the courts will not increase margins and have pegged wages, what right have we as a Parliament to say to the consumer that he shall not purchase this article because it is in competition with another article? I am ventilating this matter because I consider it is my duty to do so, firstly on behalf of the consumers and secondly of the the employees. All I can do is to submit my motion, but I ask those who supported my last Bill to support me today and I hope that I have convinced others that they should support my case. I appeal to the Government to agree to a further increase in the quota so as not to penalize consumers.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—As I followed Mr. Condon's speech

it seemed that his principal point was the subsidizing of industries against the one he referred to as being competitive. I think that there he really touched upon the whole problem, because he referred to the subsidizing of an industry which means a great deal to the economy of the whole State, and particularly to employment in country areas. It is no use our bemoaning a policy of decentralization if we are prepared to suggest that for the purpose of employment in the metropolitan area we create chaos in the country. I have some knowledge of the dairy industry, because I have had something to do with the milking of cows morning and night for seven days a week without any of the privileges of a 40-hour week. Today, this industry is subject to awards, and if it is to have its conditions of employment pegged it must have some consideration from Parliament as to the treatment meted out to it.

The margarine quota for South Australia was not decided by the State Parliament but by the Australian Agricultural Council, being fixed in 1939 at 312 tons. The legislation governing the manufacture of margarine sets down certain conditions, and it cannot be said that the South Australian Government has been tough on the industry. The Bill introduced by Mr. Condon in 1952 was sympathetically received to such an extent as to provide for a 50 per cent extension of the quota. At that time it could have been said, as the honourable member has said, that the dairy industry was flourishing. I should like to know any industry that is not flourishing today, that is if we are to judge our economy on the amount of money invested in time payment. I do not know that that is how we should judge our prosperity, but we do know that the conditions in the dairy industry today are not nearly as rosy as they were in 1952. We are facing falling prices.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You know the reason.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—Because we are outpriced, and more cuts will be made before we are much older. We must remember the principles initiated when the margarine legislation was passed. The decision made by Parliament in 1952 was supported by the Government, which had been generous, and that is the reason why we are not prepared to recommend at present any extensions of the quota.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In accordance with the usual procedure I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Leave granted and motion withdrawn.

## HUNDREDS OF CHANDADA AND INKSTER WATER SUPPLY.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table a report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the hundreds of Chandada and Inkster water supply.

## FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 379.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—As the Chief Secretary has said, it is not his fault that Bills were not before members yesterday. In some cases it is not necessary to have them before us after members have had the opportunity to peruse the explanations of various clauses; this Bill comes within that category. It has become necessary because of the great increase in the number of therapeutic substances manufactured today and widely used by the Commonwealth Government under the free medicine scheme. In the Act there are no specific conditions under which these substances are manufactured. In 1951 the Commonwealth Government called a conference between the various State Health Ministers to discuss relevant legislation to be introduced in their respective States in order to raise the standard or to establish a standard to which the drugs could be manufactured under the control of the various State Boards of Health. That conference was held, and the Commonwealth Government passed the Therapeutic Substances Act of 1953. This Bill will bring this State into line with the procedure adopted in other States and Great Britain for the control of poisons and therapeutic substances.

The principal provision is to prevent the manufacture of these substances by people not properly skilled or in places not properly equipped. With the great increase in the use of these drugs there has been a tendency by certain unskilled people to step in and produce them in places not properly equipped, particularly during the war period when there was a great demand for the component substances of these drugs. This legislation will abolish that position and bring this State into line with the standard of control I have mentioned. I commend the Bill.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—As Mr. Bardolph indicated, members are fairly well informed as to the requirements and ramifications of this Bill,

and I am in fairly complete accord with what he said. As the Minister said yesterday in his speech, the Bill deals with therapeutic substances. The word "therapeutic," which is obtained from the classics, means "cure." It will be remembered that three or four years ago the Commonwealth arranged for a conference to be held to establish uniformity in the legislation connected with drugs and matters covered in this Bill. With the increase in the Australian population, the development of science and its application to medicine it has become extremely desirable that the Commonwealth Government, the largest purchasers because of the free medicine scheme, should have a standard of quality that is both high and regular. The conference recommended that legislation be passed in each State and by the Commonwealth so that standards of purity would be attained and maintained. The Therapeutic Substance Act was passed last year and each State, on the recommendation of its board of health, has considered legislation necessary. Clause 4 provides that any drug may be declared by proclamation to be a controlled therapeutic substance and that any such proclamation may be varied or revoked. Clause 5 appears to recognize that regulations relating to controlled therapeutic substances and poisons at present administered by both the Central Board of Health and the local health authorities will have to be entrusted to the Central Board alone. The very much wider powers relating to sale, purchase, transport, ownership and possession apparently will take the place of the present limited powers. Perhaps some degree of opposition may arise, but it is considered that clause 6 is justified in that South Australia will be able to assist by developing and maintaining a uniform standard. I support the second reading.

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

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN moved—

That the Assembly's request be agreed to and that the members of the Legislative

Council to be members of the Joint Committee be the Chief Secretary, the Hon. C. R. Cudmore, and the Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph, of whom two shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

Motion carried.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

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

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time. It provides for a further £6,000,000 to carry on the public service of the State pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of £6,000,000. Clause 3 provides that payments are not to exceed last year's estimates, except that payments of increases in salaries or wages can be authorized by the Treasurer.

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

#### WHEAT PRICE STABILIZATION SCHEME BALLOT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4:17 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 24, at 2 p.m.