

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, August 26, 1954.

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

SUPPLY ACT (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the Act.

QUESTION.**TOWN PLANNING.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—A few years ago the Government of the day appointed a Joint Parliamentary Select Committee to inquire and report back to the Government on matters concerning alterations to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act. That committee, of which Sir Wallace Sandford was chairman, made investigations in all States and reported to the Government, which then brought in amending legislation for the control of abattoirs in South Australia. I should like to know whether the Government will adjourn further consideration of the Town Planning Act Amendment Bill now being discussed in another place and appoint a Joint Parliamentary Select Committee so that it can make all the necessary inquiries regarding town planning and report back to the Government before the Bill is proceeded with?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—As indicated, the Bill is now under discussion in another place and I presume it will decide what to do with it. The Bill is in the hands of the Premier and I will refer the question to him.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to require a licensed auctioneer carrying on business as a business agent to hold a licence under the Business Agents Act. At present, by virtue of section 4 of the principal Act, a licensed auctioneer is completely exempt from the requirement to hold a business agent's licence. This arrangement has a number of disadvantages. First, a licensed auctioneer may act as a business agent without depositing a fidelity bond or security. Second, it is very much easier to obtain an auctioneer's licence than a business agent's licence. An auctioneer's licence can be obtained merely by satisfying the court that the applicant is a fit and proper person. The Business Agents Act, on the other hand, requires an examination of the applicant's character and financial position. This could mean that a licensed auctioneer might be enabled to act as a business agent, although his credentials would not stand up to examination under the Business Agents Act. Third, renewal of an auctioneer's licence is automatic upon payment of the fee for renewal. Under the Business Agents Act objections may be lodged against the renewal of a licence. Moreover, there is no provision in the Auctioneers Act for the cancellation of an auctioneer's licence for misconduct. This might mean that a licensed auctioneer whose character proved to be bad could not be prevented from acting as a business agent. Fourth, an auctioneer acting as a business agent is not required to comply with a number of the provisions of the Business Agents Act which apply to licensed business agents and to which there are no comparable provisions in the Auctioneers Act. For example, a licensed business agent is required to have a registered office and to display his name or business name at his place of business. A licensed auctioneer acting as a business agent is not affected by these provisions. Nor are his books and documents open to inspection as are a licensed business agent's and there are no restrictions on the persons he may employ, as there are on the persons whom a licensed business agent may employ.

The present arrangement is clearly unsatisfactory and the Government has decided that it should be rectified. The best course appears to be to adopt similar provisions to those contained in the Land Agents Act. That Act

provides that a licensed auctioneer is not required to hold a land agent's licence merely by reason of the fact that he sells land by auction, but is otherwise required to hold a licence if he carries on the business of a land agent. He is not required to pay a fee for a land agent's licence. This arrangement will remove the disadvantages of the present scheme and is adopted in the Bill. Under clauses 3 and 4 a licensed auctioneer who carries on business as a business agent will be required from April 1, 1955, to comply with all the provisions of the principal Act except those requiring payment of licence fees. A licensed auctioneer, however, will not be treated as a business agent merely by reason of the fact that he sells businesses by auction. The exemption from payment of a licence fee is justified by the relatively high fee payable for an auctioneer's licence.

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

ANATOMY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to make provision for the operation known as corneal grafting. This is the second occasion on which this Bill has been before Parliament. It was introduced at the end of the session last year but was not proceeded with. The Government's intention was to enable members and the public to consider the proposals contained in the Bill, and to study it with the view of suggesting alterations or improvements. No representations have been made to the Government since the Bill was introduced last year, and accordingly the Government is proceeding with the Bill this session in the same form as before. Corneal grafting is a valuable surgical procedure by which the cornea of a deceased person's eye is grafted on to the eye of a living person, thereby restoring, improving or saving his sight. The cornea is the transparent covering of the pupil of the eye and corneal grafting consists of replacing damaged cornea which has become opaque by fresh cornea which has been removed from some other eye.

Last year the City Coroner drew the attention of the Government to the fact that the removal of eyes from a body even for such a meritorious purpose as this is probably not permitted by law. Certainly, the Anatomy Act makes no provision for it whatsoever. He

pointed out that the United Kingdom Government had found it desirable to pass legislation dealing with the subject, and that at a recent medical conference in Adelaide a resolution had been passed that State Governments should be approached with a request for the enactment of similar legislation. The Government thereupon decided that the law of the State should provide for corneal grafting and at the same time give proper protection to the feelings and interests of the relatives and friends of deceased persons. The Government accordingly introduced the Bill, which followed the Act of the United Kingdom, the Corneal Grafting Act, 1952, almost exactly.

Clause 3 makes an amendment to the long title of the principal Act which extends the scope of the long title to include provisions dealing with corneal grafting. Clause 4 enacts new section 18a of the principal Act. Subsection (1) of section 18a provides that a person lawfully in possession of a body, for example, an executor, may authorize the removal of the eyes to enable them to be used for corneal grafting if the deceased person has at any time expressed a request in writing that his eyes be used for that purpose or has expressed the request orally in the presence of two witnesses during his last illness. Subsection (2) provides that a person lawfully in possession of a body may authorize the removal of the eyes for corneal grafting unless the person has reason to believe that the deceased had objected to his eyes being so dealt with, or the surviving spouse or any relative objects. Subsection (3) provides that the removal must be done by a legally qualified medical practitioner who must have satisfied himself that life is extinct.

Subsection (4) provides that where the person lawfully in possession of the body believes that an inquest will be necessary, he may only authorize the removal of the eyes with the consent of the City Coroner, who may give his consent on such conditions as he thinks fit. This is the only provision which differs from the English Act. That Act provides that no authority may be given where an inquest may be required. The City Coroner recommended that it should be possible to give authority in these circumstances, subject to his consent. The Government felt that under these conditions an inquest would not be prejudiced and accepted the recommendation.

Subsection (5) provides that a person such as an undertaker entrusted with a body purely for the purpose of its interment or cremation shall not have power to authorize the removal

of eyes. Subsection (6) provides that the authority under the section may be given on behalf of a person having the control or management of a hospital by an officer or person designated in that behalf. Subsection (7) provides that the section shall not be construed as rendering unlawful any dealing with a body which would otherwise have been lawful. Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to the principal Act. Clause 6 provides that the Bill will come into force three months after it is passed. This provision will enable it to become generally known before it becomes effective.

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

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 473.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—This Bill was introduced entirely for the purpose of dealing with a technical matter that has arisen as a result of an amendment of the Commonwealth Banking Act, in which a separate institution known as the Commonwealth Trading Bank was set up. As that was regarded by law as a separate institution from the Commonwealth Bank it was felt necessary that our own Public Finance Act should be amended in order to recognize the new institution. It is mere repetition to say that the Act is very necessary in order to ratify the Commonwealth Government's action, and I therefore have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 444.)

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I rise to speak on this measure only because I think we should not pass a Bill to which is attached a schedule of infectious and notifiable diseases without some idea, even if only a rough one, of what those diseases are. It may seem to be labouring the matter, as one might well take it that a schedule coming before the Council in this form can be accepted as reliable, but I remind members of an amusing practical joke alleged to have taken place with reference to a certain imaginary disease when this Council sat in the old Chamber. I have taken the trouble to find out as far as I could what these various diseases mentioned in the

schedule mean. Acute infective encephalitis is a form of infection of the brain; amoebiasis is a form of dysentery; ancylostomiasis is a long name for hookworm; anthrax we are all familiar with and, although it does not occur very much here, it is certainly a serious matter in New South Wales. Bilharziasis probably does not occur in South Australia. It is an organism which gains access to the human system through bathing in infected waters and it invades the bloodstream and causes a great deal of trouble to the bladder. The River Nile is the classic example of an infected stream, but it is known in other parts of the world. Cholera, diphtheria, diarrhoea, dysentery and influenza are familiar enough to us; leprosy occurs in the north of Australia. Leptospirosis is a form of jaundice apparently transmitted to human beings by rats. Malaria we know. Meningococcal infection is another name for a brain disease. Ornithosis is the name given to parrot's disease. When it first occurred it was thought to be peculiar to parrots but now it is known to occur in all sorts of birds. With poliomyelitis we are, unfortunately, too familiar. Puerperal pyrexia is a fever associated with childbirth; salmonella infection is a very dangerous form of food poisoning which frequently proves fatal; trachoma is an eye infection which occurs in hot and dusty regions principally.

The third schedule is a list of notifiable diseases. Brucellosis occurs in cattle and is the cause of contagious abortion. In human beings brucellosis occurs as undulant fever. Erythema nodosum is a skin disease probably with some T.B. background. Encephalitis following another disease again is a brain infection. Filariasis is a condition caused by a worm which having entered the human system, causes a blockage of the lymphatic glands resulting in enormously swollen legs. Infective hepatitis is another form of jaundice. Ophthalmia is a severe infection of the eye, occurring mostly in hot and dusty climates; rubella is German measles. Trichinosis, if it occurs in Australia, is very rare, but in other parts of the world, including American and Scandinavian countries, the occurrence of infected animals is fairly high. It is found to affect many different types of animals. The organism gains access to the human body through people eating insufficiently cooked pig meats, and occurrence in pigs sold at abattoirs in America has been found as high as two per cent. In other parts of the world it is a serious disease. If it does not occur in Australia, we are very fortunate. It may be due to the fact that Australians are not a people who frequently eat raw ham. We

are familiar with typhus fever. I think it should go on record that this Council shows an intelligent knowledge of these diseases. We should take the trouble between us to look into the diseases named to see what they really are otherwise if we were questioned by other people and did not know what the diseases were on which we were legislating we would not appear to be too bright. I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT PRICE STABILIZATION SCHEME BALLOT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 25. Page 472.)

Clause 3—"Holding of ballot."

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—Yesterday information was sought regarding the form the ballot-paper would take. The information I have received is that the roll of wheatgrowers will include more than 19,000 persons, the names having been supplied to the Electoral Department. A further list of names of persons who have to furnish information will be supplied from time to time. It will take the department to September 17 to type the addresses and be in a position to post the ballot-papers. The ballot will close on October 8, giving wheatgrowers approximately three weeks to return their papers. This timetable must be strictly adhered to to enable the result to be available by October 15. The actual ballot-paper is headed "Ballot of (State) wheatgrowers—on proposals for the stabilization of the wheat industry." It also includes the following information:—

Directions to voter.

- (1) The State and Commonwealth Government proposals for the stabilization of the wheat industry are printed on the back of this ballot-paper. If you are in favour of the proposals place a cross in the square opposite the word "Yes" below and if not in favour of the proposals place a cross in the square opposite the word "No" below.
- (2) Sign your name or names on the envelope supplied with the ballot-paper in the space provided for the purpose.
- (3) Fold the ballot-paper so as to conceal the vote, place it in the envelope and seal the envelope.
- (4) Post or deliver the envelope containing the ballot-paper so that it will be received by the Returning Officer before 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the day and month.

What they are voting on will be printed on the back of the ballot paper. Mr. Rowe asked

about the eligibility of certain people to vote. I suggested he should contact the Minister of Agriculture. I understand he has done so and received the information desired. One other thing mentioned yesterday was whether this vote will be final. I said that I considered it would be, my reason being that last year we passed the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act providing for a poll. I have since consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Minister and find that it may be necessary to amend that Act because it provided for three years whereas the new term is for five.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I feel I must oppose the clause because I consider the ballot can materially affect the economy of the State and the whole future of the wheat industry. We are asked to pass legislation providing for a ballot, but I ask myself, "Ballot for what?" To find the answer I must turn to the 1953 Act, and I can only assume that the ballot we are asked to provide for is to establish a home consumption price in accordance with an agreement that apparently has been reached between the Commonwealth and State Governments. The only information I have on the agreement is what I have read in the press—an agreement to guarantee a home consumption price for a given period. I do not know whether that is right or wrong. It was mentioned in the press that it would apply for five years, but no mention is made of this term in the Bill. I am not prepared to record my vote in favour of a ballot on which Parliament has no definite information. The agreement between the Commonwealth and the States should have been ratified by this Parliament, because the Government is directed to meet the whole financial cost of conducting the ballot. In 1948 a similar ballot was held on wheat price stabilization. Certain information was given in the debate yesterday by Mr. Edmonds concerning the results of that ballot. He said that 16,950 ballot-papers were issued and 9,940 returned, leaving a balance of 7,010 not returned. The Chief Secretary says that on this occasion about 19,000 ballot-papers will be issued. The original Act provided that the Governor could by regulation provide for a compulsory vote.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—To what Act are you referring?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The 1953 Wheat Price Stabilization Act, in which it was provided that the Governor may by regulation provide for a compulsory vote. In other matters members have expressed themselves in favour of a majority decision by those eligible

to vote. On numerous occasions legislation providing for such a majority vote, for instance in the trade union movement, has been supported by members but on this question, one of very great material consequence to the State, a minority of those entitled to vote can say what shall be done. The section dealing with the regulations should not contain the term "may"; it should be mandatory to vote. Section 4 of the Act provides that compulsory voting can be prescribed by regulation and this amendment should provide for a compulsory vote so that we would be sure that the vote is a majority one. This measure has a material bearing on the State because it can increase the cost of living considerably and the persons hardest hit will be those who can least afford increased prices. I take exception to being asked to vote upon a measure that authorizes a ballot on an agreement between the States and the Commonwealth when I do not know anything about it. We are putting the cart before the horse; in the first instance we should know something of the agreement that has been reached, ratify that agreement, and then we should debate the question of holding a poll of those entitled to vote. I have no other alternative but to oppose clause 3.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—When a similar matter was before the House last year I took an objection similar to that I have taken on this present measure. I ask the Government not to rush this Bill through because it is one of principle and importance; I cannot see any necessity for any hurry because the position has yet to be clarified. No other Parliament has considered what we are considering this afternoon, and except for Western Australia the other State Parliaments are all in recess. Certainly the Commonwealth Parliament ratified the agreement recently but we do not know what will be submitted to the other State Parliaments. The Chief Secretary said this afternoon that voting papers had to be returned by October 15, but why should we rush the matter when the other States are not? The debate on this Bill has been worthwhile because the Chief Secretary has submitted information that we were not given before. However, he has not answered the chief objections and I ask members if they as a House of review are going to pass legislation when they do not know what it is about. If they do then I will not be on their side. I want to see a unanimous vote on this but how do I know what I am voting on. It might

be to hang the President or the Opposition or anything contrary to the wishes of Parliament.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—You have said you do not know what is in the poll. Do you mean you do not know what is in the scheme?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not know what has to be voted on. This Bill will give the farmers power to vote on the question but we do not know what we are voting on. In the past . . .

The CHAIRMAN—Before the honourable member starts I draw attention to the fact that we are still dealing with clause 3.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—And I am opposing it.

The CHAIRMAN—If the honourable member is opposing it he must give reasons that are connected with clause 3.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Another Bill must be introduced because although the agreement is for five years this Bill only applies until 1956.

The CHAIRMAN—That has nothing to do with clause 3. Whether another Bill is introduced or not cannot be discussed under this heading. The alternative is to vote against the clause.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is not just a question of whether South Australia will accept the agreement but of whether all Parliaments concerned will do so. The Ministers of Agriculture met in 1946 to discuss the question of a ballot but could not come to any agreement, and in 1948 submitted a modified agreement that was agreed to in this House. The ballot was agreed to without our knowing what was in it, although it was in a modified form. I am sure that when the other States discuss this matter they will know, and demand to know, what is on the back of the ballot-paper. We are asked to exercise our vote and we should know what farmers are asked to decide.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—We are not voting on the ballot but only giving farmers the right to vote.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We are passing the legislation, so we should know what the ballot-paper contains. I have supported this type of legislation before but is there any reason why the Government should push this Bill through now?

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—It has to be decided early in October.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—But the other State Parliaments are in recess.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Is the honourable member suggesting that the other States are likely to repudiate the agreement?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, but they will have information that we do not possess; I feel sure they will not agree to anything if they do not know what they are doing. The following table shows the result of the vote last year in the various States:—

	In	Per-centage in
	favour.	Against.
New South Wales	8,951	6,360
Victoria	11,275	3,495
South Australia ..	5,729	4,090
Western Australia	3,957	2,426
	29,912	16,371
* Average.		64*

This is not a compulsory poll although the Act we are now amending contains a provision that the Governor could issue a proclamation or regulations to make it compulsory. I understand that voting in the proposed ballot will not be compulsory, and one farmer reaping, say 10,000 bags of wheat, will have one vote whereas next door there may be a partnership of four reaping one-tenth of that amount having four votes. I know it is hard for members opposite to listen to the Opposition, but it is not all one-way traffic. We are pointing out the dangers. We want to see a unanimous vote in this place and I think the Chief Secretary should agree to reporting progress to give us an opportunity to ascertain the facts. All that we complain of is that we should at least know what is printed on the back of the ballot-paper. Is there anything unreasonable in asking what the legislation we are voting on means. All we know now is that the farming community will be asked to say "yes" or "no," but on what we do not know. I think that is a fair statement of the situation.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The farmer knows what the agreement is.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Is he passing this legislation? I am not willing to hand over my responsibilities to him and I am surprised at the honourable member's attitude, for he has always complained about giving away powers to outside bodies. If someone asked me tomorrow what I had agreed to give the farming community I would not be able to tell him.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—It is on the wheat stabilization scheme, is it not, and the scheme is explained on the back of the ballot-paper?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am not a member of the caucus of the Liberal Party

and so I do not know. We are asked to vote on something we know nothing about—at least I do not, and I think I can speak for my honourable friends. I have read of many things, but I know that things can be altered. I believe the scheme is a good one—

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—How do you know it is good if you do not know what it is?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Because I have listened to others here and probably have been taken down.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Not the first time.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Unfortunately no, because numbers count, but at least I am offering my objection and I think it is only fair to ask the Chief Secretary to report progress so that we can, if possible, reach a unanimous decision.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—Judged by the remarks of some members there seems to be some confusion as to what is entailed in the taking of the proposed ballot. In view of your ruling, Sir, I appreciate that one is somewhat restricted in the matter that one may canvass, but there are one or two points which I will submit that may dispel some of the confusion in the minds of members. As a starting point I call attention to the fact that the Wheat Stabilization Act of 1948, amended in 1952 and again in 1953, is the principal Act which is concerned in this matter and it is the scheme provided in that Act upon which the farmers are to vote by ballot. All of the conditions and all of the principles in regard to that scheme are set out in those statutes, and the only alteration will be minor matters affecting the date and duration of the scheme and this will mean, of course, the introduction of an amending Bill at a later date. If members say they do not know what it is all about it must be because their memories are short, but if they will take the trouble to turn up the Acts I have mentioned they will see that I am correct. That is the sum total of the whole thing.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Take a vote on an agreement arrived at somewhere else.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—No, on legislation that has been passed.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The agreement was arrived at only a month ago so what is the honourable member talking about?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I hope the Chief Secretary will not defer the taking of a vote because it has to be decided quickly as a great deal of machinery has to be set up and the people want to know where they stand as regards the forthcoming harvest.

Any further delay will only jeopardize the success of the whole scheme and is quite unnecessary.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Edmonds' remarks support the contention expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. He says that this will give farmers the right to determine certain things with regard to their products and we all agree that they should have that right. He also said that an amending Bill will be brought in which will contain minor alterations to the agreement. I submit that if hasty or ill-considered legislation is passed, not cast in specific terms, minor alterations can become major alterations without the sanction of Parliament.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—An Act cannot be amended without the sanction of Parliament.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The honourable member's remarks were a strong support of the Opposition's attitude. We are not denying the right of these people to determine their own issue, but as members of Parliament we ought to know what issue they are going to vote on. It is all very fine to say that an agreement exists, but that agreement is not a legislative enactment and before we give the right to vote by ballot we should be fortified with full knowledge on the issue farmers are to determine. That is the sum total of our opposition. Under this legislation it is possible, as voting will not be compulsory, for a minority to determine an issue affecting all the wheatgrowers of South Australia and the whole economy of the State. Down through the years Mr. Cudmore and the Leader of the Opposition have always taken the stand that legislation should be specific.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I congratulate the Opposition on the unanimity they have achieved in their arguments on this Bill, but I regret that it should break down rather sadly after all their warnings that members are going to vote on something on which they are entirely ignorant, for the Leader of the Opposition himself informed us that the Opposition unanimously supported a similar measure 12 months ago on the very same amount of information they have before them today. The only difference is that mentioned by Mr. Bevan, namely, that this does not include provision for compulsory voting. It is pertinent to ask, if we make voting compulsory, where we go next if everyone does not vote? After Parliamentary elections people who do not vote are fined, but the poll decides the issue whether voting is compulsory or voluntary. I do not

think members can seriously suggest that compulsory voting will alter one effective vote. If we provide a penalty and fine people for not voting the result of the ballot must still prevail, and I think that gets over the main difficulty mentioned by members opposite.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Minister says that we should know the position because we should have known what applied in the 1953 legislation. This was assented to in December and section 2 (6) provided:—

The ballot-paper shall be in the form fixed by the Commonwealth Minister for Commerce and Agriculture and shall have printed thereon or attached thereto a short summary of the proposals on which the ballot is to be taken. In spite of what was done at the conference, the Minister can come along and submit anything of which members are possibly not aware.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—Yesterday I raised points regarding who would and who would not be entitled to vote in the ballot. I had in mind a partnership with four partners and wanted to know whether the partnership would be entitled to only one vote or whether each of the partners could vote. The Minister of Agriculture has now informed me that circulars are being sent to every partnership of which the department has notice and they will obtain in the course of the next few days the names of members of those partnerships. In this regard the roll is practically completed. I understand that the time is too short to go into the matter more exhaustively. As far as is possible it will be ensured that individual members of partnerships will have a vote. Therefore, I do not wish to press any further the point I raised yesterday.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Council divided on the question that the Bill pass through its remaining stages without delay.

Ayes (13).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin (teller), A. J. Melrose, F. T. Perry, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, Sir Wallace Sandford, and R. R. Wilson.

Noes (3).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, and F. J. Condon (teller).

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.27 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 7, at 2 p.m.