LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 19, 1954.

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

QUESTION.

TRAFFIC REGULATION (LEFT-HAND TURN).

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Has the Chief Secretary noticed the report which appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* indicating that action has been taken by the Traffic Committee of the Adelaide City Council with regard to the left-hand turn by motorists through pedestrian traffic at peak hours in King William Street? If so, will the Government reconsider its attitude on the submission of this subject to the State Traffic Committee?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I have not seen the report, but when I have perused it I shall then be in a position to give the honourable member a reply.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

BREAD BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1003.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—I cannot add much to the information given to the Council by other members, but there seems to be general unanimity that the alteration proposed in the Bill is desirable. This practice has been in operation in at least one Australian State and the Dominion of New Zealand and, as far as I can ascertain, the experience there has been such as to encourage us at least to give this method of giving correct weight of loaf to the consumer a trial. Mr. Condon suggested that the wheatgrower was not giving sufficient attention to producing a higher quality wheat for the baking trade, but those of us who are familiar with the history of wheat breeding know that many efforts have been made in this direction and considerable success has been achieved. However, the problem is not quite as easy as might appear at first glance. One of the main difficulties to be overcome is to breed a wheat that is immune to many of the diseases to which the wheat plant is susceptible, and in striving for better quality it has been necessary to sacrifice some other desirable attributes. For instance, we can all readily recall the ravages of red rust and the efforts to evolve a breed of wheat immune to that disease. In the evolution of that desirable variety other qualities have had to be sacrificed almost without exception. We have not yet been completely successful in breeding a wheat immune to smut or bunt and at the same time having better milling qualities, and so one could go on at length in respect of various diseases and varieties of wheat.

I am sure that those actively associated with wheat production will support me when I say that various circumstances have been the determining factors in preventing us from following one line in producing a high milling quality wheat. For example, our methods of handling and disposal of wheat make it difficult. In one district three or four varieties of wheat may be sown, and it is harvested and eventually carted to the siding and placed in one stack. If a farmer grew a higher milling quality wheat he would first have to see that the variety was kept pure, clean and true to sample, and segregate it from any other wheat he might have grown. He would take it to the receiving agent who in turn would have to segregate it, and so the whole process would have to continue until it got to the hands of the miller who required that particular quality. Many of the purchasing countries have a need for a particular quality of our wheat; for instance, our hard wheats.

When I was actively engaged in the industry I grew on one occasion a particularly good sample of a certain variety and conceived the idea when I was harvesting it that I would put a little note in one of the bags with the request that the purchaser should communicate with me informing me of his country, what the wheat was required for, if it were up to standard for his requirements and any other comment he desired to add. Ultimately I received a reply from the South African Milling Company at Capetown to the effect that it was an excellent sample and quite satisfactory for its purpose, which was primarily to blend with South African wheat to produce a better class of flour. As far as I know that particular variety was not considered to be of high milling quality.

Although we might take much trouble to boost our milling qualities, many of the circumstances I have mentioned come into the picture. I am sure that sooner or later we shall institute a system for the bulk handling of wheat. In that event we shall meet the problem I have mentioned, and if we are to segregate particular qualities of wheat, we

must be in a position to demand a premium for them. If we go to a miller and say we have a particular wheat of high milling quality and he is prepared to pay a premium for it, we must deliver an article true to label. The only way to do that is to have receiving bins for perhaps a half a dozen different varieties to suit the different people requiring them. Growers are not indifferent to the position, but the problems I have mentioned must be overcome before we arrive at that very high ideal. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Repeal of Bread Act."

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health)—The clause refers to the Bread Act, 1936-1949 being repealed. The 1949 Act has nothing to do with the baking of bread, but with its wrapping. It will be necessary for that Act to remain independently. I therefore move—

That "1949" be deleted.

Amendment agreed to; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 14) and title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment and Committee's report adopted.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

In Committee.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1001.)

Clause 2 "Incorporation."

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I move—

In paragraph (*b*) after "municipality" to insert "or in any township within a district."

This amendment deals with the rating of urban farm lands. To avoid uncertainty in the minds of the public it is desirable that these matters be as uniform as possible, because the same things apply to country towns as apply to municipalities, so it would be a good thing to extend this provision to urban and rural lands in district council districts.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—The Bill does not apply to district councils so I think the honourable member is wise in moving this amendment, otherwise there would be no provision in the Act to prevent any attempt being made to introduce land values rating in the country.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—I find myself in a little difficulty on this amendment. I have received certain advice about it, but following other advice the matter is still under consideration. I will ask the honourable member to accept my assurance that the Government will be prepared to give him an opportunity to recommit the Bill and to have this clause reconsidered if he will withdraw the amendment for the moment.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—In view of the circumstances I ask leave to withdraw my amendment temporarily.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I move—

In paragraph (*b*) to strike out "five" and to insert "two."

As the clause stands urban land means any land in a municipality of over five acres in area. This amendment will protect people who are living off the land from farming. There are a number of people, particularly in the Marion district, obtaining a living from parcels of land of less than five acres—some of them farming land of only one acre and producing tomatoes and other vegetables. The amendment will bring perhaps 100 growers in that district alone within the protection of this amendment.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—When speaking on the second reading I said that I intended to oppose not only the amendment but the whole clause, because it cuts across the policy for which I stand. We are opposed to preferential rating. The intention of this clause is to meet a council that has evaded the Act, and I am strongly opposed to the action that has been taken.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Are you opposing the whole clause, or only the amendment?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I have no desire to repeat what I said on the second reading because probably I would be told that I am making a second reading speech. I oppose the amendment and the whole of the clause.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—This amendment sets out to remedy what the Government considers is an injustice to the man using his land in order to obtain a living. During his second reading speech the Leader of the Opposition implied that he would not support what he termed a watering down of the land values rating system. I am rather surprised at his attitude in this matter, because the Government is taking action that it considers will be in the interests of all people, particularly the smaller people. He pointed out that five acres was an arbitrary figure, and I agree. It was put into the Bill for this House to review and

consider as an acreage that might be raised or lowered. Mr. Anthoney is testing the feeling of the House by suggesting that it should be reduced to two. I remind the Leader that the lower the figure becomes the more assistance will be given to those who have the same political views as he has and the same hardships that he frequently attributes to them.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What would have been your attitude if I had moved the amendment?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am sorry that the honourable member missed the opportunity. The Government realizes that the more land a man holds the smaller is the service given by the local council. At the same time we have to consider the difficulties of council administration. I would like to think that any person who earns his living directly from the land, as opposed to merely living on it, could be assisted under this Bill, but as Mr. Cudmore so often says, "Hard cases make bad laws," and the difficulties would be almost insuperable if we reduced the area to very small proportions. The amendment will bring in many small market gardeners, whereas those who hold only half an acre—to go to the other extreme to suit members opposite—often have only a dwellinghouse on it, and land values rating applied to half an acre does not become intolerable. The Government therefore is prepared to accept the amendment.

The Committee divided on the Hon. E. Anthoney's amendment—

Ayes (14).—The Hons. E. Anthoney (teller), J. L. S. Bice J. L. Cowan, C. R. Cudmore, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin, 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).

Pair.—Aye—The Hon. R. J. Rudall. No—The Hon. A. A. Hoare.

Majority of 11 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I move to insert the following new paragraph:—

(*c*) by inserting at the end of subdivision (*f*) of paragraph (1) of the definition of "ratable property" and at the end of subdivision (*d*) of paragraph (2) of the said definition in each case, the words "and any land held by the owner for the purpose of the erection thereon of a school."

In view of the vote just taken I think the same principles should be extended to those who, when subdivisions of land are made, have the foresight to purchase land for future schools. I have in mind one instance in my district where the rates on land that was purchased for a future school have gone up from £40 to £140 and no school has been built because the population is not yet sufficient to warrant it. The amendment simple extends the principle that the Government has just accepted in Mr. Anthoney's amendment. This land cannot be used for agricultural purposes.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—But it must be valuable land.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is not. It consists of sandhills at Taperoo. It comprises an area of eight acres and rates have been paid on it for a number of years.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am somewhat surprised by this amendment because the mover has had a fortnight to examine this Bill carefully and I would have expected some earlier indication of an amendment of this nature. The Committee has nothing in print before it, but nevertheless I think members can follow the purpose of the amendment fairly easily and therefore I am prepared to give it a reasonable hearing. I point out that members opposite who favour the land values rating system are now endeavouring to get an exemption from rates that they have found objectionable, so I find them most inconsistent. It is already the Government's policy to give rating concessions to schools.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Ever since 1923.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Yes, but if we allowed people to purchase land and immediately seek concessions on the ground that a school may be erected perhaps 20 years hence I feel we would be handicapping the people living in the district. Therefore, I suggest that the amendment should not be accepted.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—The amendment is not before us in print and usually in such circumstances we ask for a postponement. However, there are so many amendments on the files that I think it is desirable to deal with this one immediately because it seems to be obviously out of place where it is suggested. Section 169 of the Act provides:—

Such part of any land and buildings or land situated in any area as is used for the purpose of any school or academical institution as which fees are charged shall be assessed at one-quarter of the amount of the annual value or land value thereof, as the case may be.

That provides for every piece of land used for educational purposes, but if it is desired to extend it to the buying of land which in the distant future may be used for educational purposes it should not be done in this section which deals with the provisions of certain

remissions, namely, to schools, shows and recreational organizations. It would be contrary to the whole drawing up of the Bill if we were to put in an additional definition after "ratable," so I hope the amendment will not be accepted. If the honourable member wants the amendment inserted I suggest he moves for an alteration to section 169 (1).

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Like the honourable member, I accept advice from a person who is responsible to this Parliament and advises members on procedure to be adopted concerning amendments. I appreciate the advice given by Mr. Cudmore, but remind him that my amendment is only an amendment to the definition. If he reads it he will find that his observations are not in accordance with the amendment. When the Committee reported progress previously, during the course of his remarks the Minister said there were many amendments to clauses in the legislation and he hoped members would review the Bill and come back today with any amendments. Because I have the temerity to submit an amendment he takes the stand of a schoolmaster and attempts to admonish me. I submit that this is the proper place for the amendment, but if the Minister desires, I am willing that he should report progress. Then the amendment could be placed on the files.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I do not like to be misquoted. When speaking on the matter previously I said:—

As several members have placed far-reaching amendments on the file I think it would be desirable to report progress, and I move accordingly.

As I still have not a copy of the amendment but have accepted it with the knowledge of what the honourable member intends to do, I have no hesitation but to oppose it.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—In my opinion the Minister has been over-generous in extending time for consideration of the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—He also was not ready to go on.

The Hon. E ANTHONEY—The Opposition are using stone-walling tactics to block the passage of the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Those remarks are offensive to me, because I am not adopting stone-walling tactics in moving my amendment, and I ask for their withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN—If the words are offensive to the honourable member, I am sure the honourable member will withdraw them.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—No offence was meant.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member has not withdrawn his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN—I ask the honourable member to withdraw his remarks.

The Hon. E ANTHONEY—I withdraw. The honourable member must have known the implications in his amendment. The land in question is under land values rating, the very system which the honourable member is now condemning. The honourable member has had ample opportunity in the last three weeks to submit his amendment, but to hold up the Bill now is a little unreasonable.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I was somewhat impressed by Mr. Bardolph's statement. Any ratepayer who has had his rates increased from £40 to £140 must inquire the reason. It would appear there has been an anomaly and now the honourable member wants to alter it. I do not blame him. If a system is wrong, one has to adopt all kinds of expediencies to get rid of anomalies, and that is what the honourable member is trying to do; but I feel that we cannot support a system which produces anomalies and then seek to apply remedies at every point. I consider that the system of rating which the honourable member is supporting has created the anomaly, and that his amendment will create more. While I have every sympathy with him, I cannot support the amendment because the building of the school may never eventuate. His suggestion is too nebulous for the Committee to consider.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—In view of statements made concerning the amendment and the fact that I have just been handed a copy of it I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I am sorry that in my previous remarks I underestimated Mr. Bardolph's desire in this matter. I thought he was asking that land bought by a church for the erection of a school at some future date should be rated at only quarter rates, in accordance with section 169, but I find he wanted much more, namely, that these properties should be non-ratable. Therefore, I apologize for trying to correct him and saying that his amendment should appear under section 169. I think his proposal is rather ridiculous and oppose the amendment.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—My proposal would cover either land values or improved

values rating. I remind the honourable member that State schools do not pay any rates. I am not seeking to get something from the community to hand over to one section at the expense of the major portion of the community. In addition to paying quarter rates, private school properties are compelled to pay for roadways, kerbing and footpaths at the full rate. If the amendment is not carried these people will be penalized for looking ahead.

The Committee divided on the amendment—

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

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

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Committee divided on the clause.

Ayes (12).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Condon, C. R. Cudmore, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude (teller), A. J. Melrose, F. T. Perry, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, and R. R. Wilson.

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

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

New clause 2a "Voting at elections."

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

2a. Section 120 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words ", by making a cross, having its point of intersection within the square opposite the name of the candidate" in paragraph VIII thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "by marking the voting paper in manner provided by section 120a".

This afternoon we were told that this is a House of review, but I point out that this Bill was introduced in this Chamber. There are a number of amendments on files and although I gave mine to the Parliamentary Draftsman last Friday week unfortunately the Printing Office is understaffed, having lost employees to outside industry prepared to pay higher wages, resulting in the delay in the amendments being printed. This amendment deals with preferential voting. For a number of years we have had preferential voting for the Commonwealth Parliament, the State Parliaments and referendums, and the only elections where this system does not apply are council elections. In every other State council voting is by the preferential system. Every member of this chamber owes his seat to the fact that in the plebiscites of both Parties they are elected, not by a cross, but by the preferential system. I seek to have the Act amended to avoid confusion and make voting in all matters uniform. A great number of people who attend polling booths on election day ask whether they have to vote by means of a cross or a number.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Quite obviously Mr. Condon went to considerable trouble to draw up these amendments which I have no doubt represent the careful and considered views of his Party. I would be the first to say that in elementary elections it might be desirable to follow a system of voting by numbers.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What do you mean by elementary elections?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Those with two candidates for one seat. Because of the considerable number of amendments I think I would be right in suggesting that the Committee take a test vote of clause 4, the result of which will be effected in the remaining amendments.

The Act now provides that voting at council elections is to be by crosses. The effect of the new clause is to provide that voting is to be by numbers and that votes are to be counted according to the preferential system of voting. The preferential system applies to State and Commonwealth Parliamentary elections and, at first sight, it would appear desirable to have the same system at council elections. However, Sir, the preferential system is not ideally suited to council elections. In many local government elections only one candidate is to be elected. Now this is the case in municipal councils where the mayor or one councillor for each ward is to be elected. In such cases, however, it is unusual for there to be more than two candidates and, consequently, there is no necessity for preferential voting and a transfer of preferences. Thus, in practice there would, in most cases, be no different results if the voting were by crosses or according to the preferential system. In instances, however, a council election requires two or more candidates to be elected. This can occur in aldermanic elections and occurs with some frequency in district council elections. Some district councils are not divided into wards and several councillors are elected at the same time at the one election. In other cases, where the district is divided into wards, the

town ward has three or more members, so that at some elections two members have to be elected for the same ward.

It is generally recognized that the preferential system is open to objection when applied to multiple electorates and these objections would particularly apply to these elections in the country. The counting of the votes in such a case and the allotting of preferences is a matter of difficulty and productive of delay. The carrying out of such a system would, if adopted for local government, be required to be carried out by returning officers from country councils who would, in instances, lack the experience necessary to perform the duties efficiently. I am certain, Sir, that all members will agree that we do not want any bungling in council elections because councils sometimes do not have suitable officers to conduct preferential polls.

Another objection is that the preferential system when applied to multiple electorates leads to a tendency—an undesirable one I suggest—to pit one group against another, and consequently tickets are printed urging people to vote along group lines rather than for the individual, which is vital if we are to have satisfactory local government. Proposals for preferential voting have on several occasions been considered by the Local Government Advisory Committee which has recommended against their adoption and, therefore, for the reasons I have expressed I trust that the Committee will reject the Leader of the Opposition's amendment.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Minister's arguments would have been all right in a kindergarten if we were endeavouring to introduce something new, but this system is already in operation in Parliamentary elections and supported by both Parties, and all I am asking is that we should extend it to council elections. I know that this will be decided by a Party vote and I do not object to my friends opposite voting as they may determine, but I do not want to be told that this is not a Party House. I shall be quite content to accept the decision of the Committee but I sincerely hope that members will deal with my amendment on its merits.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I hope the Leader of the Opposition will not despair because he thinks that this may be determined on Party lines. Theoretically one might be inclined to support the amendment as we have preferential voting in other spheres, but I think the Minister's explanation in opposing the amendment was a very good one. The mover has had local government experience and he will know that sometimes there are, say, several men standing for one aldermanic position. If we complicate the counting it will require a much more experienced returning officer than councils usually provide, and it will increase the cost of local government. I have no rabid objection to the system beyond the fact that it will tend to make local government considerably more difficult. I think we should be guided by the Local Government Advisory Committee and not cast a hasty vote which will have the effect of changing something which has functioned satisfactorily for a considerable time. If I thought that we could replace the present system by a better one I should certainly vote for it regardless of Party, but I do not think that this is an improvement and consequently I will not support the amendment.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—After listening to Mr. Condon's introduction of his amendment I could find only two reasons for it; one was that there was a different system in operation in other spheres, and the other that he wanted to avoid confusion. As to the first, I do not see any reason why because there is a different system in regard to other elections this should be adopted in respect of council elections. As to avoiding confusion I can see more likelihood of confusion in a complicated system of preferential voting than if we carried on as from time immemorial by indicating our preference by a cross. Therefore, whilst not being so conservative as not to listen to anything new I want to satisfy myself that what is new will be an improvement and in this instance I do not think it will be.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I must admit that the amendment appeals to me and I do not think that the average district clerk, after he became acquainted with this system, would find any difficulty in counting a preferential poll. It is a more or less simple method to which everyone has become accustomed and it should not be beyond the capacity of any district clerk. Preferential voting has been adopted in the majority of Parliamentary elections and therefore I am prepared to support the amendment.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I am not convinced that the amendment will effect any improvement. We have become accustomed to preferential voting for a multiplicity of candidates and a multiplicity of opinions among electors, but in local government it is usually difficult even to get candidates to stand for

election, and the man who has the job is usually left with it as long as he will remain. Also the issues are usually clear-cut and the ordinary voting by cross has been quite satisfactory over all these years. I therefore propose to vote in support of its retention.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I support the amendment and am surprised by the remarks of members who oppose it. The preferential system is the evolution of a democratic method of electing representatives to our public institutions. You, Mr. Chairman, are probably aware that at one time in this State members of Parliament were elected by a show of hands and the candidates who could gather sufficient supporters and provide sufficient refreshments were usually elected. It was from that political travail that crosses were instituted and as we progressed preferential voting became the established order of the day. That was brought about not by the whim of any political Party. It was proposed by commissions set up from time to time to ascertain the best way for the public to give a true and free expression on various public matters.

When my honourable friends say that council elections are totally different from Parliamentary elections I remind them that the Local Government Act is one of the most important on our Statute Book. It deals with a number of subjects, and is an important adjunct to our representative system of government. It is wrong to attempt to draw a line of demarcation between the method of electing members of councils as against electing members of Parliament. The question has not been raised as a political issue by the Opposition; all we desire is to give the right which exists in Parliamentary elections to people to express their opinion in selecting their council representatives. I am surprised that the Minister will not accept the proposal. His argument cuts right across the whole fabric of our professed views on democracy. It is not a question of proportional representation, but of preferential voting, upon which we were elected, and the same system applies in the election of the national Parliament.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Many amendments to the Bill have been submitted and progress was reported last week at the suggestion of the Minister so that members could study them. The Minister admitted that he knew last week that this amendment was coming forward, and Mr. Condon has explained why it was not before members until they took their places this afternoon. It is all very well to say that it means only a change from the use of crosses to preferential voting. I think I am right in saying that I know less about local government than at least 12 other members of the Chamber who have had considerable experience in this field, but I think we are entitled to give this large amendment some consideration rather than accepting it after it has been recommended with only a few words. I ask the Minister to report progress so that members who have not had an opportunity to study the amendment until this afternoon can look at it and consider their position.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—It is true that members have not had an opportunity to study the amendment, and in view of their representations I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1004.)

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—In their remarks members have given the impression that there is very little to be said about the Bill, because all it sets out to do is to reduce the charges made to sellers of cattle which go to the credit of a compensation fund. On an examination of the position I find there is a good deal more to be said than has already been said on the matter. The cattle compensation fund is one of those instrumentalities which protect consumers from having foisted upon them meat which is unfit for human consumption. In the Eastern countries it is the practice to retain a piece of the beast like the head or the tail attached to a carcass when it is exposed for sale in the bazaars so that the buyer knows from the evidence of his own eyes that he is buying steak that it is not from a camel or a donkey, or that he is buying the meat of a goat or something else. Under the Act there are only four of what might be called compensatory diseases:—Actinomycosis which is a rare disease affecting the bone structure; contagious pleuro pneumonia, which is also uncommon; Johne's disease which is unknown in South Australia, and tuberculosis. From 1948 to the present time the total cattle condemnations have ranged from .319 to a maximum of .5. Those condemned for tuberculosis ranged from .101 in 1952 to a maximum of .186 in 1950. That is an average of

total condemnations of .4 per cent, including .14 per cent for tuberculosis. It appears that many animals are condemned for other than the notifiable compensatory diseases. The condemnations for causes other than these four diseases average about .274, so that the condemnations as unfit for human consumption are greater for disqualifications for other than one of the four diseases than for all of the compensatory diseases. The compensation fund has now grown to over £70,000 because the claims made upon it are very small, due to the small number of cattle disqualified for these four diseases. From inquiries I have made from people connected with the breeding and marketing of cattle and the processing of the bodies I feel that the payments should not be lessened but the benefits should be extended to cover people who suffer losses from causes other than these four diseases. There are two classes of cattle vendors—the big breeders and the numerically much stronger small breeders. When cattle belonging to a big breeder are condemned for not compensatable causes the vendor invariably meets the purchaser and makes some compensation. In the case of the little breeder, the person who sells one or two cattle, his contribution to the fund is almost negligble and it would not matter very much whether it was raised or lowered by a halfpenny. If his cattle are condemned the loss must be borne by the purchaser.

I have spoken a good deal about the condemnation of cattle for other than the four specific diseases. Many cattle reach the abattoirs after a long and rather tedious rail journey and occasionally one sees outbursts in the press about delay in transit and the hardships suffered by cattle *en route*. However, there are employees in this industry who travel to the railheads and back with the cattle to take care of them and see that they receive all the attention that can possibly be given them to ensure their safe and comfortable transport. I think also it will be found that they do not allow overcrowding of the trucks or the trucking of sick beasts anywhere, although some cattle tend to break down on the way. Despite all the care taken accidents do happen to cattle. Perhaps from some cause or another a beast lies down through sickness or weariness and the jolting of the train causes other cattle to trample or fall on it. The result may be that it may be anything from very badly bruised to dead on arrival. Although this beast may be very badly bruised, on casual observation it may not appear to be suffering from anything although on slaughtering it may be wholly or partially condemned. In that case the vendor may meet the purchaser, but if the beast comes from a small breeder the loss is customarily borne by the purchaser. If the beast is condemned as being unfit for human consumption the vendor is just as much worthy of compensation as he would be if the cattle had one of the compensatory diseases, such as T.B. There are certain forms of septicaemia. If cows are near parturition, or if cattle are found to be in a fevered condition or it is found that they are moribund, which means that for some reason or other they suddenly appear to be dying, perhaps between the saleyard and the slaughterhouse, these conditions are not necessarily discernible at the time when the animal is in the sale ring and is shuffled around under the auctioneer's hammer. It is more often the case that it is only when slaughtered that the inspector finds that they are not fit for human consumption. I suggest we should not go on with this Bill but that the Government should give it further consideration and look into the matter as to whether the rate of levy in this Act should not remain at its present level and allow the fund to go on accumulating. After all, £70,000 is not a very great sum if one visualizes what an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia could cost today, when a good bullock is worth about £50 or so.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Some association must have approached the Government asking that this be done.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I remind the honourable Leader that we are a House of review. With his assistance I suggest we prevent the people from taking a short-sighted step. I suggest to the Government that further consideration be given to this Bill with the idea of maintaining the levy at its present level so that the fund could reach perhaps £100,000 to meet any unexpected outbreak, and further, because the fund is obviously greater than needed to deal with the four specified diseases, and realizing that tuberculosis is being steadily eradicated from the world's herds, to extend it to cover losses by vendors for causes other than the four specified diseases. I will not support the second reading in the hope that the Government will withdraw the Bill entirely for the time being and look into the matters that I have raised.

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

POLICE PENSIONS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1005.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—Since my university days I have always realized, and emphasized when I have spoken publicly, the importance of real co-operation between the police and decent members of the community. I have emphasized that it is one of the things that really counts in the life of a community. Unfortunately it sometimes happens that parents, instead of bringing up their children to realize that the police are their friends and will help them cross the road and that sort of thing, have a tendency to say "Do not do that or I will tell the police" instead of dealing with the children themselves. I am glad to see that in the last few years there has been a great difference and a great improvement in the spirit existing between the general public and the police in this State, and I would like to pay my tribute again to the behaviour of the police and generally to the standard of the force.

It is quite obvious always that any force, whether the army, the police, or a football team, is only as good as the people at the top, therefore in paying this tribute I obviously mean to include those who are at the top as well as every member of the rank and file. That comes back particularly to the Honourable the Chief Secretary, who administers the Police Force, and to the Commissioner of Police. As honourable members will recollect, after the Royal visit I had occasion to draw attention to the example we had during that visit of co-operation between the police and the general public, and I sincerely hope we will preserve that precious feeling, because obviously it is a precious feeling that all the people in the community and the police should be friends and that the few outsiders should be against the law. From these remarks I think it is quite clear that I approach this Bill in a mood not only to be just but to be generous in any pension scheme that we adopt for the force. Last year we recast to a great extent the police regulations and administration, and I imagine this Bill follows that up and is to put in order the question of police pensions. Since the consolidation of Acts in 1936 we have had no fewer than seven amendments to the Police Pensions Act all of which are repealed by this Bill. That is sufficient in itself to show that a new Police Pensions Act is necessary and that this Bill should receive our best attention. It is not one that anyone could oppose on the second reading. It provides a new scheme of pensions which I think is generous. Mr. Condon made comparisons with the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund, but I would rather compare it with schemes which involve considerable numbers, such as the South Australian Superannuation Fund and private funds in commercial undertakings. Although I have gone to some trouble in getting figures I find it almost impossible to draw any real comparisons; this is a different sort of scheme from most others. Contributions to the South Australian Superannuation Fund are governed by the number of units taken up by the individual, and he may increase the number as his salary grows. Contributions at the beginning look very small in comparison with those in this Bill, but because this is completely different it is not possible to compare the relative amounts contributed by the individual and eventually received as pension.

Mr. Condon quoted from the Auditor-General's Report the amounts standing to the credit of the fund and the proportions contributed by the individual and the Government, but again I find it almost impossible to compare that with the unit system under the South Australian Superannuation Fund. I also find it impossible to compare it with private commercial schemes which are almost always based on percentage of salary—and the higher the salary the higher the contribution, whereas, as I understand this scheme, the individual pays an annual contribution based on age of entry and continues to pay the same amount. Another thing—and this is quite unusual—this Bill provides for a capital payment of £1,250 on retirement as well as a pension of £364 per annum. Generally speaking, I am rather opposed to capital payments on the grounds that the money may be completely wasted, but apparently this system is preferred by members of the force. I have no doubt that in some cases it will help them to become interested in a small business to occupy them after their capacity to undertake this strenuous work of a policeman is over, and there may be good reason for it in this case, but that is another reason why it is not possible to draw any satisfactory comparison. Therefore, generally I think the provisions are good and generous and I have no hesitation in supporting them.

However, there are some matters on which I shall ask questions in the Committee stage. For instance, clauses 9 and 10 are somewhat unusual. In most superannuation schemes and

endowment and provident funds it is made quite clear how much each individual and employer shall pay, but in this case clause 9 says that the Public Actuary shall say how much is to be put in, whereas clause 10 is the usual clause in nearly every provident fund which provides that a quinquennial assessment shall be made by the actuary showing the state of the fund—whether it is solvent, or whether more has to be contributed to make it a workable proposition. Therefore I do not understand why there should be both a quinquennial and an annual review. Also in Committee I shall ask a question on the retrenchment mentioned in clause 26, namely, "If a retrenchment is made those members shall be retrenched who have served the shortest time in the force." That seems to be something which should have been in the Administrative Act passed last year and somewhat out of place in this Bill. I think much better principles could be adopted.

The next point is, probably, a legal one. Clause 37 provides that if a pensioner deserts his wife the Chief Secretary may, among other things, pay his pension to his wife. I do not know who is to establish that the pensioner has deserted his wife, or what sort of proof will be required. That requires some amplification. My last point is in regard to the last clause which gives power to make regulations. There was a time when in almost every Bill that came along I attacked the scope of the power, but this one is a little out of the ordinary, for it says:—

> The Governor may make any regulations which are necessary or convenient for the administration of this Act and may, by any such regulation, provide what is to be done in the circumstances arising in connection with matters dealt with in this Act and not expressly provided for by this Act.

I shall probably be told that this has been accepted in several Bills without comment by me, but this is certainly the first time I have noticed it and I hope to receive some further explanation as to why it is expressed in this way and what it means. On the whole I think that this Bill provides an excellent pension scheme for the Police Force and I have pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—I join with the tributes made to the Police Force by other members. I think we have one of the finest police forces in the Commonwealth and its members are highly regarded by the community. I, too, find it difficult to compare the Police Force with any other branch of the Public Service because the duties are entirely different, in as much as although other public servants work from Monday to Friday or Saturday the policeman is on duty every day of the week without the penalty rates that are accorded to other civil servants. This, I think, has brought a certain degree of unpopularity to the force and men are finding much more attractive positions outside. Indeed, their services are being sought by outside organizations and many young policemen have been taken from the force at higher salaries and better conditions. We had to recall the lamentable fact recently that 20 to 30 promising young policemen had left the force for other employment. If men take the short term view—and I think it is a short term view—and accept these apparently attractive offers the Public Service will become depleted, and the Police Force is no exception. Consequently I think the time will come when the Government will have to consider bringing the Police Force into line with officers of other departments in respect of penalty rates, thereby making the service more attractive to young men. The Bill is very generous. At times the other States were ahead of us, but this Bill will bring us close to their standard. It provides for one feature which is not common to police pensions funds in the other States in that a lump sum is paid to a retiring policeman. The present Act provides that on retirement a man receives a full pension of £312 for the first five years and thereafter it is reduced to half, but the Bill amends that position and he receives a full pension of £364 for all time. I am sure the Bill will meet with the full approval of members of the police force, and if it will do anything to help popularize the force and induce others to enter it, the Government will have done a good service. It is based on a proper actuarial basis and therefore I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

INFLAMMABLE OILS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 959.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—At a first glance the Bill appears to be one of a minor character and removes any doubt as to the employment of watchmen in licensed oil stores, such as the big oil installations in and around the district of Birkenhead and elsewhere. Undoubtedly, these establishments

require to be watched continuously because the likely possibility of fire with its resultant heavy damage is not remote. There have been instances in other parts of the world of a considerable loss of life and damage to property caused through fires in oil installations, there having been one recently in Japan. Therefore, I feel it is necessary to have adequate watching facilities at oil installations. Those in South Australia have grown tremendously in recent years. Not only has this growth applied to storage, but also to population and to the extension of factories in the areas concerned. If a fire occurred at one of these installations at Birkenhead it could result in enormous loss of life and property in the vicinity. The Act is divided into two parts, one dealing with registered premises and the other with licensed stores. Under the heading of "Registered premises" it is provided:—

If over 1,000,000 gallons of inflammable oils are kept in any registered premises the person keeping the inflammable oil shall provide a watchman or watchmen so that the said premises are under continuous supervision. Penalty not exceeding £100.

Another portion of the Act applies to registered premises where the maximum capacity storage does not exceed 800 gallons. It seems anomalous that the Act should make these two separate provisions. There is no doubt that the section I have quoted applies only where more than 1,000,000 gallons are stored. As recently as 1950 one oil installation at Birkenhead had no watchman employed. In explaining the Bill, the Chief Secretary stated he had no doubt that in any prosecution for a breach under the Act the court would read the section I have referred to as applying also to a licensed store. Under the Act the only policing authority is the Chief Inspector of Inflammable Oils. In 1950 I drew his attention to the fact that there was an oil installation in the Birkenhead district which was not employing watchmen in accordance with the Act. After he had examined the Act he informed me that there was no provision under the heading of "Licensed stores" to say that this particular store had to be watched, and that the section I have referred to did not apply. He added he was powerless to do anything in the matter. That is contrary to my belief. Later the company employed a watchman.

The Chief Secretary also stated that the main reason for the Bill was because of a dispute which had arisen between the South Australian branch of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union and the Shell Company of Australia regarding the employment of watchmen at its Birkenhead installation. I submit that that is not the main reason. Because of the danger at this installation and as there are many factories and houses in the vicinity, it is imperative that these installations should be watched. I agree with that portion of the Bill providing for this. With the specific clause under the heading that it is under, the 1935 Act is definitely defective, and something had to be done about it. To remove any doubts on the matter, it has been necessary to introduce this measure.

When introducing the Bill the Chief Secretary said that this clause should apply and in his opinion would apply under the heading of "Licensed stores," but experience has shown that the chief authority under the Act does not agree with that contention. The Bill will remove any doubt as to the meaning of the clause. The Chief Secretary referred to a dispute between the South Australian branch of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union and the Shell Oil Company, and said that the main reason for the amendment was this dispute, but I think he should have given more information than he did. The dispute is over the employment of watchmen in Shell Oil Company installations. Some time ago the union furnished a full report to the Chief Secretary and with the indulgence of the House I would like to place the report before members. It is as follows:—

I wish to submit a report of the dispute that exists between the Shell Company of Australia Ltd., and The Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union of Australia, South Australian Branch. The above company had employed three watchmen at their oil installation Birkenhead for a number of years, and one of the watchmen concerned had been employed continuously as a watchman for over 12 years. These men were members of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union, and they were subject to the Watchmen's Board Determination. The first incident in the dispute was a notification by the company to the watchmen that their services in that capacity would no longer be retained, and that henceforth they would be employed in the "yard" as general labourers. In view of the fact that the men were members of this union, together with the fact that we considered the Shell Company were committing a breach of the Inflammable Oils Act, my State Council instructed me to interview the management of the Shell Company and also Mr. McColl, Chief Inspector of Inflammable Oils.

The interview with the Shell Company elicited the following information:—(1) The company had decided for economic reasons to dispense with the services of watchmen. (2) The company would employ instead, one man from 4 p.m. to 12 midnight for the five days Monday to Friday inclusive each week, as storemen,

members of Storemen and Packers' Union. (3) Three other men would be employed from 12 midnight to 8 a.m. for the five days Monday to Friday inclusive each week, as storemen, members of Storemen and Packers' Union. (4) In addition to this, it was the intention of the company to employ casual watchmen during the weekends for the purpose of watching the installations. From investigations conducted by officers of the union, it has been ascertained that the men employed during the week are required to grease and clean forty-five (45) lorries each night, and also fill the lorries with bulk spirit. The performance of these tasks necessitates the confinement of these men to what is known as the south compound, and as a consequence a large area of the installations is left without any supervision. These men do not perform watching duties during the night, nor have they been requested to do so. As a matter of fact the tasks assigned to them engage practically the whole of their attention during the night, in storemen's duties as outlined above.

It has also been ascertained that the Shell Company has not been successful in obtaining the services of a watchman or watchmen for the weekends, which means, in effect, that no person is present on the premises from midnight Friday to midnight Sunday of each week. During the course of the conference, the union representative pointed out that in the opinion of the union, the mere fact that employees were engaged in a restricted area on certain tasks did not constitute continuous supervision as required by the Act. A further conference was held with the management of the Shell Company, but they remained adamant to the appeal of the union that they should re-employ the men concerned as watchmen. The secretary of the union then sought an interview with Mr. McColl, Chief Inspector of Inflammable Oils, in reference to this matter. The secretary informed Mr. McColl that in his opinion the company was contravening the section of the Inflammable Oils Act which reads as follows:—"If over one million gallons of inflammable oil are kept in any registered premises, the person keeping the inflammable oil shall provide a watchman or watchmen so that the said premises are under continuous supervision."

Mr. McColl pointed out that the above provision was placed under that section of the Act that dealt with Registered Premises, and in view of the fact that the amount of oil which may be stored in registered premises was restricted to an amount less than a million gallons the provision therefore had no application to registered premises. He stated that in his opinion the provision relating to watchmen should be placed under that section of the Act entitled "Licensed Stores." He suggested, however, that it might not be advisable to give this anomaly in the Act any publicity, as other employers might take advantage of the loophole in the Act, and dispense with the services of watchmen. Mr. McColl also stated that he had been assured by the Shell Company that the premises were being adequately watched, and apparently Mr. McColl was satisfied by the assurance given to him by the Company.

Nothing further eventuated in the dispute until the union was informed that the Shell Company had asked His Honour (Mr. President Pellew) of the State Industrial Court to call the parties together in conference with a view of effecting a satisfactory settlement of the dispute. The parties assembled before His Honour in Chambers and after all aspects of the matter had been discussed, His Honour suggested the following conditions as a basis for settlement: "That the Shell Company shall employ one watchman on each shift and that they take advantage of Definition A. of the Watchmen's Determination."

Definition A. in the Watchmen's Determination reads as follows:—"'Watchman Class A. means any watchman who, in addition to or as a part of his ordinary duties is required to perform any other work for which under any Award, order or Determination (whether applicable to watchmen or not) a rate of payment is prescribed which is higher than the rate payable to him under this Determination."' This settlement was acceptable to the union, and during the conference representatives of the company did not raise any objections to it. Although the conference met several months ago, the Shell Company has not yet implemented the conditions suggested by His Honour. I understand that this matter has been brought to your attention and you are no doubt familiar with what has transpired in the Legislative Council.

That is a reference to questions I had asked about the Act some time ago in this Chamber. The report concluded:—

Investigations conducted recently by the union revealed that the position remains unaltered and the same conditions prevail as are outlined in the above report.

The same conditions prevail today, and we feel that it is necessary to have some amending legislation brought down because the Chief Inspector has given another interpretation that coincides exactly with that which he gave on this Bill in 1950. Mr. McColl, I understand, advised the company that it had no duty under the Act to employ watchmen. Watchmen have been employed for a considerable number of years by the oil companies and they have been specially trained to stem any fires that may break out in the installations until the arrival of the fire brigade. Incidentally, there are direct alarms from the premises to fire stations. The companies have always felt it imperative to train these men and have them on the premises.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Which union do they belong to? There are two unions concerned—the Miscellaneous Workers Union and the ordinary workers in the Shell Company.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—If the honourable member had been in this Chamber and had heard me he would have known that I was

referring to the training by oil companies of watchmen to fight oil fires. These watchmen are members of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union of Australia (South Australian branch). They are acting under a State determination which lays down wage rates and conditions, they have a seven-day week and work longer than 40 hours a week and their wage rates are the lowest of any paid by oil companies, yet the company has said that it cannot still employ them for economic reasons. I am concerned about the adequate watching of premises in the event of a fire, and the resultant damage.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Isn't that the only thing that matters?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It is, as I have always said. I raised three questions in this Chamber on previous occasions on this matter and the only thing that I was concerned with was the adequate watching of these premises for the safety of the whole area, including all homes and factory installations. That is all I am concerned with still. If a fire broke out there would be considerable damage, because if one tank exploded it would extend to all others and it is anyone's guess as to what would be the result. The Shell Company's installation at Birkenhead is in two parts known as the north and south compounds. In one of them the tankers which convey petrol to service stations are refilled and serviced during the night ready for the drivers to take out next morning. Employees responsible for this work are engaged under the Storemen and Packers' Award and not as watchmen, and their duties are sufficient to occupy the whole of their eight hour shift. The other compound is quite separate and is not watched at all. The Chief Inspector of Factories has expressed the opinion that while there is someone on the premises those premises are being adequately watched. Section 17 (i) of the principal Act reads:—

All reasonable precautions, whether prescribed or not, shall be taken for the prevention of accidents by fire or explosion, and for the prevention of unauthorized persons having access to the inflammable oil kept in the store, and against every act whatever which tends to cause fire or explosion and is not reasonably necessary.

I suggest that that provision is not being given effect, hence the necessity for this Bill. I shall oppose new subsection 17a(2) and 17a(4). Dealing with (4) first, I admit that it says "without reasonable excuse," but who is to say what is a reasonable excuse. Through inadvertence a person delegated to act as watchman may fail in the performance of his duty.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—The same provision appears in lots of Acts.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It does not appear in the Industrial Code as far as I know and it is wrong to enact such legislation.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Why?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—A person is employed under a contract of hiring to do a certain class of work and if he fails to do that the employer has his remedy, and always has—instant dismissal.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Would it not be too late after an explosion?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Would it not equally too late to impose a penalty of £50? I submit that the Industrial Code gives the employer that power and so does every award, not only in this State but under Commonwealth Awards also.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—But don't you think the public also wants to see that he does his job?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I agree, but I say that the penalty is already provided for and can be applied by the employer at any time, and we should not provide for another penalty, which is liable to create considerable discontent and, I say advisedly, could cause an industrial upheaval. New subsection 17a(2) reads:—

Subsection (1) of this section shall be deemed to permit the appointment of persons to act as watchmen who are also required to perform duties other than that of acting as watchmen.

This has been introduced by reason of the report of the Chief Inspector of Factories who contends that as long as a person is on the premises those premises are being adequately watched. A clerk may find it necessary to work overtime and the management could inform him that while so working in the office he was also to act as watchman and see that everything throughout the installation was safe, and if he failed in this duty he could be fined £50

The Hon. F. T. Perry—But that could not happen.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I say that there is nothing in this legislation to prevent it because the Bill gives the employer that authority.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—An employer is not going to jeopardize his own interests.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Because of what is going on at present I say that no underwriter

would be prepared to accept a risk on these installations, which shows how inadequately watched they are. I have already shown this afternoon that one company employed no watchmen in 1950, so it jeopardized not only its own property but that of everyone else. No one was on the premises from the time the day workers finished at 5 p.m. until they recommenced at 7.30 a.m. next day.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—And how far away are the nearest houses?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Right on the boundary. The whole district is thickly populated.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—It will be worse than an earthquake one of these days.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It is far from my intention to attack any oil company, but I am concerned with the safety of the homes and the lives of factory employees and other workers throughout the district of Birkenhead. The Shell Company employs one man between 4 p.m. and midnight, and the report furnished to the Chief Secretary by the union outlined his duties. He has to attend to 45 tankers and what he cannot do is completed by the second team which comes on later. That man is confined to the compound where the tankers come in and his duties take up the whole of his shift so that he has not time to act as watchman. To go around the other compound once would take up one hour of his time and so he cannot do this. The consequence is that while that man is on the premises they are not being adequately watched. When he finishes at midnight three other storemen and packers are employed and their duties similarly occupy their full time. They are not employed as watchmen, but under a contract of hiring by the week as storemen and packers, and as such have their own duties to perform. It is impossible for them to act in a dual capacity. In those circumstances it cannot be said that the premises are being watched adequately. I commend that part of the clause which provides that an employer shall have his premises adequately watched, but oppose the other two subsections referred to and intend in Committee to move for their deletion. Road oil tankers are fitted with a chain which hangs on the ground to provide against the possibility of fire through lightning. If it is necessary to have such protection on a vehicle, surely it is doubly necessary to make adequate provision for the watching of premises with huge oil supplies. All that should have been enacted was the inclusion of the portion of the clause referred to in that part of the Act where it was originally intended.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly with amendments.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 3).

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

VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Continued from October 13. Page 960.)

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 20, at 2 p.m.