LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, August 28, 1956.

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

ASSENT TO ACT.

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the Appropriation (Flood Relief) Act.

QUESTIONS.

CONDITION OF CITY BRIDGE.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Has the attention of the Minister of Roads been directed to the condition of the road at the northern end of the city bridge where the Tramways Trust has recently taken away tram tracks, leaving the road in such a state that it is a virtual death trap for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic? Will he take the necessary steps to see that it is put in good condition?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—From the remarks of the honourable member, I would say that the matter has been delayed because of the very inclement weather and because it is desired to have the road put in a proper condition.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—It was reported in the press that it is expected that a change will be made in Government hospital charges. Will the Minister of Health inform the House what that change is likely to be?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—It has been found necessary to institute a nominal charge for patients in Government hospitals, to take effect from Monday, September 3. However, it is not quite as forecast this morning. The actual charges that will be made for "public bed" patients will be £1 15s. a day, "non-public bed" patients will be charged £3 a day, but pensioner patients with entitlement cards and infectious disease and poliomyelitis patients will not be charged. All patients who are qualified to receive an allowance under the Commonwealth benefits scheme will be allowed 12s. a day if members of an approved insurance organization and 8s. a day if not members. These charges have been assessed on such a basis that they can be covered by a nominal insurance.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about accident cases?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—Accident patients will be charged the same rate as "non-public bed" patients, £3 a day. In country Government hospitals the charges will be similar. Patients in private rooms, where we have them, will be charged £3 a day, and the other charges are similar to those that will be made at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. At the Mareeba Babies Hospital ward patients (other than infectious disease patients) will be charged £1 10s. a day. There are occasions when it is considered advantageous to have the mother at the hospital to suckle the child; they are provided with full board, and will be charged 12s. 6d. a day. Again, all patients who are qualified to receive an allowance under the Hospital Benefits Scheme will be allowed 12s. a day if members of approved organizations, and 8s. a day if not members. The term "non-public bed" patient is intended to apply to patients who have to be admitted to hospitals as a result of emergencies, and for various reasons are found to be in a position to pay a fee commensurate with the cost of maintaining patients in hospitals. The average cost of maintaining a patient in the Royal Adelaide Hospital for the year 1954-55 was £4 3s. a day, and the average for the six country Government hospitals £3 17s. 6d. a day. It is known that the costs for 1955-56 were higher than in the previous year, but the actual figures will not be available for two or three days.

The term "public bed" patient is intended to apply to patients admitted to hospital through normal channels and who are generally regarded as not being in a financial position to afford the full fee. It is proposed in the first instance to charge all these patients the full fee of £1 15s. a day, but where they can show the department that they are not in a position to pay the full fees, consideration will be given to remitting a portion or, where necessary, the whole of the fee so that no undue hardship will be inflicted.

Members will appreciate that to institute the old system of the means test would require the provision of a considerable amount of staff, which would be expensive to the Government. The proposed system will mean that all public patients will be charged and only those who consider they are not in a position to pay will have their cases investigated. In that respect it will not mean any considerable increase in the clerical staff of the department.

We have resisted the application of any charge for a considerable period. The larger

States of New South Wales and Victoria initiated this system. It has been in existence there for some time, and has now been introduced here almost compulsorily, and will return only a small percentage of the cost of operating Government hospitals.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—It is a case for lotteries.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—Those States that have lotteries have had to make charges a long way ahead of this State, and that usually applies, not only in hospitals but in other directions. The fact remains that the fee is a nominal one, and the Government has approved it as being necessary. It represents only about 35 per cent of the cost last year, which was £4 a day for each patient. We have had an increase since then in the salaries paid to nurses and a general increase in all costs.

The Hon. K. E. J BARDOLPH—Are the proposed charges being imposed at the insistence of the Commonwealth Grants Commission? The Minister mentioned that they are being brought about almost compulsorily, and the report in the *Advertiser* stated that the Grants Commission had insisted upon these charges being made. Can the Minister of Health say whether that is a fact?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The honourable member is always concerned at the attitude of the Grants Commission and any influences it may have on Government policy. These charges are a matter of plain common-sense. The Government is responsible for keeping this State on a responsible and safe path, and in view of the increase in costs and the amount of revenue forthcoming, whether through taxation or the Grants Commission or any other source, it has been proved that the Government, despite its efforts to hold to the position of a free teaching hospital, is no longer able to do so.

CHEMISTS PRICES.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. President, with your permission and the concurrence of the House, I desire to make a short statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—A statement appeared in the *Advertiser* this morning to the effect that chemists' prices are to be recontrolled. I am not taking umbrage at that, but I want to know what action has been taken by the Government to control the wholesale prices of drugs sold to chemists for the purpose of making medicants.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I am not aware of any differentiation by the Prices Branch between the wholesalers and resellers. I assume that the whole position has been examined, but if the honourable member will provide any particulars of differentiation to the department the matter will be investigated.

HIDE AND LEATHER INDUSTRIES LEGISLATION REPEAL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 320.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—In 1939 the Commonwealth Government, under National Security regulations, enacted control over the hide and leather industries, and this was carried on until 1948. At that time the Commonwealth Government had no power of control in this matter and the State decided to take over the control of the industry. When introducing the measure into this Chamber the Chief Secretary said:—

> The Government is advised that the master tanners, leather manufacturers and footwear manufacturers are all in favour of continuing the control of the industry for the time being. The Footwear Manufacturers' Executive Committee, in a memorandum to the Prime Minister, pointed out that a cessation of control must necessarily bring about a serious rise in the price of leather and consequently in the price of boots and shoes.

He went on to say:—

> Further, if the Australian manufacturers had to pay export prices for leather they would be in an unfavourable position in competing with imported footwear.

However, I would suggest that the Australian manufacturers were in a position to compete in the local market with overseas buyers for hides, and notwithstanding that fact they were unable to compete with the imported article. It is remarkable that the manufacturer had to be protected against competition for the hide and against the imported footwear.

I can remember quite well when these regulations were introduced in 1939 for it had a quite serious effect on the price of cattle in the open market. The price of stock fell by about £2 a head as a result of these regulations, whereas during the currency of the legislation the prices of leather goods were extremely high and to purchase the leather required on a farm was like purchasing silk—a very costly affair. These regulations operated from 1948 to 1954 and it has now been decided that the necessity for them has ceased. Mr. Bevan said, "Without this legislation there would

have been insufficient leather for the manufacture of leather goods and boots and shoes.'' He also said that there would have been a shortage for the armed forces. However, this legislation was passed in 1948, which was after the war, so perhaps that point does not apply.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It was in operation under the Commonwealth from about 1939, and the 1948 legislation only carried it on.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—When the board decided to wind up its affairs there was a sum of approximately £5,000 left over. The Commonwealth Act provided that this sum should be applied towards the cost of any legal proceedings or claims and, subject to such claims, be paid for the benefit of the hide and leather industry in such manner as the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture approved. I contend that the industry was protected throughout the operation of this legislation and that the relatively small sum of money in question should be set aside for an investigation into the hide and leather industry to ascertain why our local manufacturers must have protection in the purchase of hides as well as against the imported article.

Some people place a lot of faith in controls and I heard on the air last night and saw in this morning's press that the Government proposed to place controls on the pig meat industry. During last year those operating in that industry experienced the worst conditions in the existence of the trade. A well established firm in one of our country districts states that it was the first time in its 80 or 90 years existence that it had been unable to pay a dividend to shareholders and the first year that it had been financially in the red.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—What has that to do with this Bill?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I am referring to the question of controls and I express great pleasure that this Bill will terminate the control of the hide and leather industry as what I have said demonstrates beyond question that controls can be very injurious. I thought I might not be trespassing too far if I quoted the position of the pig meat industry to illustrate the effect of controls on our economy. In South Australia we have today some 72,900 pigs whereas 10 to 20 years ago the number was 190,000. Last year we had 84,500 which to some extent met the requirements of the trade, but this year, owing to the lower numbers, plus the 33 per cent increase in our population—

The PRESIDENT—I am afraid the honourable member is stretching the Bill further than he should and I think he should come back to it.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Generally speaking, the imposition of controls is a short range view. Owing to the control of the hide and leather industry many of our tanners went out of existence and we lost the benefit of that competition and I would say that that applies in other walks of life. The point I was trying to make in regard to the pig industry was that, although it appears that controls are effective at the moment, they have the effect of taking people out of industry and the final result is more disastrous than the evil we seek to remedy. I have pleasure in supporting this measure.

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

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 321.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—The amending Bill is introduced to correct certain anomalies, and I congratulate the Minister for presenting it. It is a long delayed but useful reform. Every time the Attorney-General brings in such a Bill it should receive our full support. It has taken 80 years to bring about this simple reform, and it will have the effect of bringing our law into line with the English and interstate law. I believe that most reforms stem from the Law Society, and others are the result of suggestions by judges and magistrates.

More than 20 years ago Parliament felt constrained to set up a Law Reform Committee, but it met with much hostility from certain sections of the legal profession, who thought there was no need for reform. After sitting for many months the committee made recommendations which were later put into operation. I have taken much interest in this Bill because I, like other members, am faced with problems from constituents regarding the law of property because they feel it is not working justly. I suggest that a small Parliamentary committee should be appointed to consider interstate laws and those of England so that our laws can be kept in line with them.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Particularly as to industrial matters.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—No doubt that could be considered also. It need not be a large committee. I have had brought under my notice certain other directions in which our law could be inquired into. Those of us who have any dealings with charitable institutions have had instances brought to our notice of people leaving their estate to a charitable organization, which meets with difficulties because of claims made by next of kin. In one instance two organizations with which I am connected agreed to allow the next of kin to share in the benefaction, but it took a long time. In some instances much injustice is done. In one case I have in mind great consternation was caused in England some years ago due to a decision made by the highest court of the land because the testator gave his trustee power to "distribute his estate among such charitable institution or institutions or other charitable or benevolent object or objects as the executors in their absolute discretion select." This will was declared invalid and void by the Supreme Court of England. The trustee had already distributed a large proportion of the very large estate. The reason for the decision was that the law is that the only time the testator can allow a trustee to select the objects of his bounty, apart from those specifically directed under the will, is when those objects are charitable within the meaning of that word in law, as some benevolent institutions may not be charities in the eyes of the law. There was much argument, and the court held that because the testator had mentioned "benevolent" institutions in his will that voided the whole of the will. I do not know what action was taken after that.

The same thing prevails in South Australia, and the Attorney-General's Department might well look into such questions and see if our law cannot be brought into line with that of England and that prevailing in New South Wales and Victoria. There are also questions concerning payments under the Maintenance Act. In South Australia, after probate has been granted, only six months are allowed in which a claim can be made. Much injustice can be done, as that is a very short time for making a claim. In New South Wales and Victoria it can be made so long as the trustee has anything to distribute. That is reasonable. In South Australia if a claim is not made within six months, although I understand it can be extended in certain circumstances to 12, a person loses his opportunity to do so. I therefore suggest that a small Parliamentary committee should be set up to scrutinise interstate and English Acts so that we can keep our law up to their level and so that reforms can be made not in 80 years, but in a shorter time.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Is not that a reflection on honourable members?

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—Not at all. The Minister knows that very well. He will see when he goes overseas, as I hope he will shortly, that in the House of Commons a great deal of the work is distributed amongst members.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—That is only because they cannot all get into the House.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—That is true, but there are many committees there, which is a good thing because it brings members into closer contact with the work of Parliament and shortens discussions in the House on these matters. I commend the Minister for introducing this legislation, and trust that further opportunities will be given to him and his department to introduce other valuable reforms to the law which will be of benefit to the community.

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

ROYAL STYLE AND TITLES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 322.)

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—This very short Bill is intended to define the titles of Her Majesty the Queen that can be used in documents in South Australia. Royal titles, and titles of all types, have been rather glamorous in the past, but circumstances and events have instituted changes and even Her Majesty's advisers have had to alter the titles by which she is designated. That seems quite reasonable. Time alters things, and changes that take place must naturally affect titles in various parts of the Commonwealth. I have no objection whatever to this, but point out that when the Constitution Act of this State was formulated a good many years ago it contained a form of oath, to which every honourable member subscribed, which recognized the Queen as Queen in South Australia. I do not know that any Act is in force that gives a title to Her Majesty. Certainly this Bill does not amend any Act, but prescribes that all references to Her Majesty in any other Act will be altered to the form it proposes. It seems to me that as we are proud of the status of our Parliament and the sovereign rights of our State we could have preserved the form

of this oath, in which Her Majesty was referred to as Queen in this State.

I understand that self-governing dependencies of the Commonwealth have the right to designate themselves the title by which they will address Her Majesty, so the Queen is addressed by various titles in various parts of the Commonwealth. In England she is not addressed as Queen of England, but as Queen of the United Kingdom, Northern Ireland and her dependencies beyond the seas. I suppose Canada is mentioned in that country, and the name or our own country is inserted here.

It is now proposed that we eliminate any reference to this State in the oath. We are naturally pround of our State and I think its name should be perpetuated wherever possible, so I am rather surprised that the Attorney-General has not sought to retain this provision. I suppose it is desired to have a uniform title in the whole of Australia, and the Commonwealth Act has been brought down to provide for this. We are copying the title as prescribed in that Act, and although that may be convenient I do not think it is a step to be taken lightly.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Won't all interstate Parliaments be passing similar legislation?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I do not know; presumably they will, and it may be compulsory for them to do so because Her Majesty's title was decided on by all the Premiers of the Commonwealth in conference, with a provision that each would add his country's title. However, we have submerged ourselves in the Commonwealth by eliminating any reference to South Australia in this Bill. That may be because of a change in circumstances, but although 70 or 80 years ago we were proud to refer to Her Majesty as our Queen, we will not be able to do so in future, and I am sorry that this is so. This shows that the march of time has brought about a change in the status of South Australia compared with 70 or 80 years ago. The Commonwealth has taken authorities over and above the States, as it evidently has the right to do, but it is a matter of regret that the sovereign status of Parliaments should be subject to such conditions. I support the Bill in the belief that the Attorney-General will have a reply to what I have said, and will give reasons for the change.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MOTOR PARKING).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 323).

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I am not satisfied with the explanation given by the Minister when introducing this Bill. He was very vague, and before I declare my attitude on this matter I would like a few things cleared up. The traffic problem is very important and something will have to be done to meet it. I realize that a Bill of this type was introduced in Tasmania in 1954 but was amended in the following year, and similar legislation has been introduced in other parts of Australia. I have always found that a Local Government Bill causes more debate than any other legislation introduced into Parliament, probably because a number of members have had municipal experience. I have a great regard for people who give their services voluntarily to local government, but I want to know why there has been a departure in this case in that the Bill does not apply to district councils. In today's *Advertiser* under the heading, "Act may Change the U.K. Motoring Pattern" the following appeared:—

Britain's Road Traffic Act, 1956 which became law earlier this month, is regarded as the most important piece of road transport legislation enacted by Britain since 1934. Courtney Edwards, Motoring Editor of the London Daily Mail, says it could drastically change the whole pattern of motoring in Britain.

Compulsory vehicle tests, sweeping new parking rules, heavier penalties, wider powers of disqualification, differential speed limits—these are just a few of the changes which will help to turn grey the hair of harassed British motorists. It will be more difficult than ever to park a car in Central London. The Minister of Transport is trying to keep all private cars out of Central London.

One of his new weapons will be the parking meter. He now has power to approve plans for the use of these devices for both short-term and long-term parking. It will probably cost 1s. for one hour, 2s. for two. If a motorist overstays his time he may be liable to a "fine" of between 7s. 6d. and 10s.

Never before has the British motorist been under any legal obligation to pay a charge for leaving his car on the highway. The motoring organizations have fought this parking meter business tooth and nail.

This is the experience of London, one of the chief cities of the world, where this was introduced, and people concerned took strong objection to it. I admit that in various parts of the Commonwealth strong objection has been taken to the introduction of similar legislation. In the end, however, those people who

had been critical were very favourably disposed towards it.

There are one or two main issues in this Bill. One is the provision of the necessary powers to enable municipal councils to introduce the parking meter system in streets within their territories. It prescribes streets in which meters can be installed and where stands for vehicles can be appointed. If a stand is equipped with a parking meter the person who wishes to leave his car in the space inserts a coin and the meter indicates the time he is entitled to park.

The intention of the Bill is to relieve some of the traffic congestion in Adelaide, but will it? Firstly, is the parking meter to be a deterrent to parking in streets or is it to be merely a means of revenue? Is it desirable that meters should be used? If the purpose of the amendment is to deter car drivers from parking in streets, there may be some virtue in it, because streets are designed for moving traffic. If people congregate on the footpaths to gossip and thus impede the flow, they may be asked to move on. Congestion in Adelaide streets has resulted from the concentration of business and traffic in a relatively restricted part of the city, and it is high time that business and traffic were directed to other parts of the city. If the purpose of the Bill is to encourage parking in our main streets, will it not cause greater trouble?

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Does not the honourable member think that it might discourage parking in the streets?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not think so. My opinion is that main streets are not the places for parking. Many people drive cars but they leave them on the outskirts of the city because there are no parking places in the city, and they catch a tram for the remainder of their journey. Under this legislation there will be more congestion in our main streets, because I think that parking meters will add to the trouble. It has been suggested that the travelling public should be provided with parking areas, and quite recently an officer of the Architect-in-Chief's Department advocated a parking space under a proposed new building, but the land is too valuable to be used for that purpose. That suggestion was favoured in certain directions but strongly opposed in others. Parking meters will give an advantage to persons able to pay, and they will monopolize the whole space.

I cannot understand why the Bill makes no reference to district councils. There are many sizeable towns in some district council areas. The purpose of the amendment is apparently to provide revenue, but why should district councils be deprived of the opportunity of sharing in this revenue?

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Are you aware of any of them asking for it?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If one particular body asks for some concession in this direction it does not mean that other people should not be entitled to it.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Perhaps not, but have they asked?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am not concerned about that; I am concerned about the general public—the ratepayers. If there is any revenue to be received, they should have the opportunity to share in it.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—I thought you were against the legislation.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Honourable members do not yet know where I stand on this measure, and it will need a great deal of explanation to clear up the position in my mind. The Minister could perhaps explain why he has departed from the usual procedure in this legislation. The position today is that any by-law, when passed, must come before Parliament before it can operate. The Bill, as I understand it, provides that as soon as the City Council passes a by-law it becomes operative. Can the Minister explain that? That is a very important matter, and I would like all honourable members to think about it. Mr. Anthoney is chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and will know what the procedure is. When I looked at this legislation originally I did not think there was much objection to that provision, but when I found out that it was a departure from what Parliament has been used to I felt bound to point it out.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Would you prefer it to be done by a simple resolution of the council?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I prefer no departure from the present requirement, which is that when a by-law or regulation is passed it does not become operative until it is laid before both Houses of Parliament. Members then have a certain period to move for its disallowance and disallowance in either House is sufficient to prevent it becoming law. Under this legislation something different is proposed. If honourable members look at other clauses of the Bill they will note that a by-law under this legislation can be passed by a simple majority, and that when amended it

does not come before Parliament. These are things I want the Minister to have a look at and explain.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—It is like section 92 of the Constitution; we have to bring things up-to-date.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—There are a lot of things the honourable member would introduce which would not stand if they were tested. The Government has tried to do certain things which are a contravention of section 92 of the Constitution. I am pointing these things out so that members will study this legislation carefully. We all admit that things are getting out of hand, but there is no reason why an unfair advantage should be taken in order to get legislation passed without anybody having a look at it.

Under this legislation, a by-law can presumably be passed by a simple majority, but to make a resolution it is necessary to have a majority of two-thirds of the members. Why is not an absolute majority necessary in any case? That is a point I would like the Minister to explain. I would also draw honourable members' attention to the maximum penalty of £20 which is prescribed for some slight offence; that is too high.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—That section applies to penalties that can be fixed by a court, not what the council can impose.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Penalties should be heavy where necessary, and some penalties for serious charges are not high enough. However, when it comes to petty offences I have always opposed heavy penalties and will continue to do so.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—It is still at the court's discretion.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It will appear as though Parliament had intended such a penalty, and they can say they are carrying out the intentions of Parliament in imposing the maximum fine. Section 475b deals with procedure as to by-laws. It provides that after confirmation by the Governor the by-law shall be published in the *Gazette* and then laid before both Houses of Parliament. I am always desirous, within reason, of helping any municipal council, but I think this legislation should have very close scrutiny for I am not prepared to give to outside bodies such power as is proposed under this Bill. However, if the Minister or any member can clear up the position to my satisfaction they can be assured of my support.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

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

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill appropriates an additional £7,000,000 for the purposes of the Public Service for the year ending June 30, 1957, pending the passing of the Estimates and the Appropriation Act. Supply Bill No. 1 provided £7,000,000 for a like purpose, and this amount will have been expended by the end of August. It is estimated that the amount of expenditure to be authorized by this Bill will meet financial needs for September and October. This is the usual Supply Bill submitted to Parliament prior to the passing of the Estimates and I commend it to the consideration of members.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill is to meet commitments of the Public Service and does not need any debate. Members will have opportunities to air their grievances when we are discussing the Appropriation Bill so I shall leave any remarks I may wish to make until then. Looking at the sum of £7,000,000 I am sure Mr. Anthoney will say, "Thanks for the memory when we used to pass no more for 12 months' supply." I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—At the request and on behalf of Mr. Bardolph I move that the motion standing in his name be postponed until Wednesday, September 5.

The PRESIDENT—Standing Order No. 73 lays down that a notice of motion called on in its order and not moved shall lapse, but Standing Order No. 123 gives a right to the member to have it reinstated on the Notice Paper for the next day of sitting.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It was called on and I moved accordingly, and I think it has been done repeatedly.

The PRESIDENT—It has to be called on by the Clerk as it is on the Notice Paper and must be dealt with in accordance with the Standing Orders.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.24 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 4, at 2 p.m.