LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, September 3, 1957.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION.

PARINGA BRIDGE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I ask leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The Paringa Bridge has for some considerable time been an annoyance and a source of worry to people who travel on the Sturt Highway. The Minister of Roads has from time to time put various plans to officers of the department who in turn have submitted plans to him. In the last few days several planks on this bridge have broken and the position is now quite dangerous. Can the Minister say what stage inquiries into this matter have reached?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—About 18 months ago it was decided to replace the entire decking of this bridge. Several schemes were suggested, such as metal strips, concrete decking and so forth, and as a result plans were drawn for various alternative systems of decking the bridge. However, the flood intervened and as a result of the flood it has become essential to rebuild or replace two main bridges in Renmark, and to complete the road north of the river which envisages two bridges on the Paringa causeway. In the opinion of the Government these matters must take priority over the decking of the Paringa Bridge. With regard to the honourable member's statement that the bridge has become dangerous in the last few weeks, I will check on that statement and see that any necessary temporary measures are taken. However, it is not considered to have a higher priority than the bridges that have collapsed around Renmark due to the flood.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The PRESIDENT—I have to inform members that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive them for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.30 p.m.

At 2.20 p.m. the President and honourable members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.45 p.m.

The PRESIDENT—I have to report that, accompanied by honourable members, I attended at Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply adopted by the Council on August 21. His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:—

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the third session of the thirty-fifth Parliament, and also for your greetings on the extension of my term of office. I feel confident that yon will give full and careful consideration to all matters placed before you and I pray God's blessing may crown your labours.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: HUNDRED OF WINNINOWIE.

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:—

That it is desirable that that portion of the travelling stock route in the hundred of Winninowie, containing 258 acres, extending south-easterly from Kay's Crossing to the northern boundary of section 124 in the same hundred, as shown on plan laid before Parliament on August 21, 1956, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1953, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1944.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. SIR LYELL McEWIN.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) moved—

That two months' leave of absence be granted to the Chief Secretary (The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) on account of absence overseas on public business.

Motion carried.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from House of Assembly and read a first time.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Received from House of Assembly and read a first time.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE WORKS (INVESTIGATION) BILL.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to refer to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works certain questions relating to the drainage of land within the metropolitan area. Read a first time.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 27. Page 455.)

Clause 2—''Incorporation.''

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—Mr. Condon asked if there is any provision in the Act requiring that balance-sheets should be presented and audited; there is no such provision. He also said that this was an important matter, and that it should be compulsory. I submitted this statement to the Registrar of Companies, who informed me that there are about 1,600 associations in South Australia registered under this Act, and in his opinion there is no public demand for the presentation of balance-sheets or statements. Only public companies, guarantee companies and no-liability companies are liable to furnish balance-sheets, and as they represent only about 10 per cent of total companies it can be seen that it would be unreasonable to impose this obligation on all registered associations.

Most of the registered associations are sporting or church groups that register purely to be able to hold property as legal entities, and it would be a burden for them to have to file annual financial returns. They are of a non-trading nature, have no shareholders and very few creditors. The financial returns interest only the members, who are quite capable of looking after such matters, so it is felt that they should not be required to present audited balance-sheets to the Registrar. That was the position under the old Act, and we have had very few complaints, so I do not think it is necessary to carry out Mr. Condon's suggestion.

Mr. Cudmore suggested that clause 2 should be amended by adding after ''transfer'' the words ''already registered.'' I have spoken to the Registrar-General of Deeds about this suggestion and he pointed out that if these two words were inserted only those *bona fide* transferees who had registered a transfer would be protected, whereas it is the intention of the Government that all *bona fide* transferees should be protected. The Registrar-General therefore advised that the Bill as drawn will meet the situation.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I still do not understand this position. The old sub-section is really an amendment inserted last year in the consolidation of the Act. Section 22 (4) provides:—

An association shall not transfer its property until the expiration of one month after the publication of the last notice which it has given, nor, where an application to the local court has been made, until the court so orders, and any transfer in contravention of this subsection shall be void.

It is proposed by this clause to strike out some of the words inserted last year. The Attorney-General in his second reading speech said that the Registrar-General had said that the words interfered with the indefeasibility of titles and therefore should be struck out. What does the clause mean? Can people still go on at any time executing a transfer, or am I not reading it correctly? Is one month the limiting factor? I think it would be safer to provide that anything put before the Registrar-General shall not be declared void, but the Government wants to go further by providing that any transfer that has been made between individuals, whether it has been to the Registrar or not, shall be declared void.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—As members know, anybody who searches at the Lands Titles Office is entitled to assume that property is subject only to the encumbrances, mortgages and so on that appear on the title. That is the basic principle of the Real Property Act—that anyone who acts on a search of the title is entitled to assume that that is so, even though someone might have registered a transfer of the title. As last year's Act was worded, it meant that a transfer that was fraudulent and was registered would be void. That obviously cuts across the basic principle of the Real Property Act, so to preserve that principle it was felt that these words must be altered. The amendment seeks to look after the interests of people who purchase property *bona fide* and for value, and so provide that, notwithstanding that there might be some fraudulent circumstances in the earlier transactions, they are protected. Under section 22 (4) an association is required to abide by the provision relating to one month. The amendment is designed to protect *bona fide* purchasers for value.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—Reference has been made to the transfer of land from an incorporated body to an unincorporated body, or another body having a charitable object. Some legal minds think it is not a wise procedure to have properties so transferred. Can the Minister give an explanation of this?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I have had that matter considered also, and am advised that there is no objection to the words ''incorporated'' and ''unincorporated'' being left in

the Bill. It is felt that if property is transferred to another body, whether it be incorporated or unincorporated, there is sufficient protection.

Title passed. Bill reported without amendment and Committee's report adopted.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

Continued from August 27. Page 461.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—When this legislation was introduced into this Chamber in 1955 I think the prestige of the Council was enhanced considerably by the manner in which it was debated and passed. On that occasion the marriage age was fixed at 18 years and 16 years for men and women respectively, without any qualifications. One division was taken, and that was on the question of whether the age should be 16 or 15 years for women. That was defeated, and the measure was passed on the voices.

The only alteration in this Bill is an amendment inserted by the House of Assembly to the effect that where the parties are under the ages of 18 and 16 years respectively and they receive the consent of their parents to the marriage, the matter must be submitted to the Minister administering the Act who, after considering all the circumstances, can give his consent if he considers it desirable. After the case has been thoroughly investigated, he will no doubt act on the advice of his officers.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—In other words, parents have no rights at all.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—They have a right, and I will deal with that point later. Sir Arthur Rymill gave a lot of thought to the Bill and delivered a well reasoned speech in opposition to it. However, I feel sure that had he given the same amount of consideration in support of the Bill he would have made an even better contribution. He said jackdaws strut in peacocks' feathers and skim milk masquerades as cream. With regard to those remarks, I point out that skim milk on an average contains 10 to 11 per cent of solids, not fats, so it is of some value.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—I did not think that was so.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—It is. It contains calcium and proteins which play a very important part in bone structure and body building. With cream, it represents about 15 per cent or 16 per cent of the components of milk.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What has this to do with the Marriage Bill?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I am coming to that. The other 84 per cent to 85 per cent is water, and I suggest the arguments of Sir Arthur Rymill, although well presented, represent 84 or 85 per cent masquerading as skim milk. Let us examine his remarks in detail. He said that the sole effect of the Bill was to withdraw the rights of consent from the parents of young people. It does take away from the parents the sole right of saying "yea" or "nay" when the parties are under the ages of 18 and 16 years respectively, but the consent of parents will help to influence the Minister in arriving at a decision.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—The Minister still has the power to by-pass the parents.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Section 26(4) of the Marriage Act reads as follows:—

> If the Minister is satisfied that there is no such parent or guardian resident in South Australia or, if in the opinion of the Minister any such consent is being unreasonably withheld and that in the circumstances of the case it is desirable that the marriage should be celebrated, the Minister, on the recommendation of the principal registrar, may by notice in writing authorize the celebration of marriage without consent as aforesaid.

If the Minister considers the consent of the parents has been arbitrarily withheld, I take it that he has the right to give consent under this Bill to a marriage of people under the ages of 18 and 16 years. If the Minister has the right to over-ride the will of the parents who withhold their consent, surely he should have the right to say whether marriage is desirable in the interests of young people, and whether it is in the interests of society in general and of the State in particular.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Wouldn't the parents be better fitted to make that decision?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—The Minister has power under section 26 to grant permission even though the parents withhold their consent.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Isn't it the people who count rather than the State?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—The State is made up of the people who live in it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Don't the people come first?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Yes, and the people as a whole have a right to consideration. I suggest that the Minister would grant his consent in circumstances where it is desirable that the marriage should take place and after the case has been thoroughly investigated by welfare officers and the police. Where evidence suggests that the marriage is undesirable and not in the interests of the young people themselves or society in general, consent will be withheld. Some marriages contracted today, sometimes at the point of a gun or because of the desire of parents to cover up an unfortunate misdemeanour, are fruitful grounds for the development of delinquent children and in some cases of criminals.

The other point made by Sir Arthur Rymill was that the Bill, as now drawn, could be construed as reducing the minimum age. I suggest that the Bill, if passed, will indicate that Parliament considers that the age of marriage should be 18 years and 16 years except in special cases which will be thoroughly investigated by the Minister or the court, and the Minister would conclude that Parliament considered the present ages under Common Law altogether too low and should be 18 years for men and 16 years for women except in special circumstances. Sir Arthur indicated that the present marriage ages in this State of 14 years for young men and 12 years for girls are not fixed by the Marriage Act but are a survival of the English Common Law. He said that the English Common Law is something to be properly revered by every thinking British subject, that it was built up by the experience of centuries, and should not be lightly discarded. Great Britain herself, in 1929, after careful consideration, departed from the Common Law and fixed the age of marriage at 16 years for both sexes. New Zealand did the same four years later. During that long period no amendment has been found necessary, indicating that the people of those countries are well satisfied with the departure from the Common Law.

Sir Arthur stated that illegitimacy places a stigma on the child, but these children are infinitely better off if adopted by some of our best families, as they are in many cases, than by being brought up, as often occurs, in a very undesirable environment. Sir Arthur made a mountain out of a molehill, and his arguments are not borne out in everyday practice.

The principal reason for the alteration of the Marriage Act is to protect young people from unhappy early marriages. The provisions of the Marriage Act prohibiting minors from marrying without parental consent does not protect young people adequately. Where an unmarried girl becomes pregnant the parties are often forced into marriage by their parents, and such marriages are not usually satisfactory.

Attention must also be drawn to the great difference between the ages of consent under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and under common law as operates in this State. The marriage of young girls is often entered into to save the reputation of the parties, and in many cases to save the young man concerned from prosecution. Such marriages frequently fail, and when they do the children of the marriage become the responsibility of the State. Girls over the age of 16 usually marry men about their own age, but in the case of younger girls there is a greater discrepancy in the ages. In recent years there have been no instances in South Australia of girls under 16 years of age marrying, but last year in Australia two girls of that age married men between 30 and 35 and two married men between 25 and 30, and many marriages in this category are to save the man from prosecution.

In considering this question we should, I think, be influenced to some extent by the practices in other countries. As I have already stated, Great Britain passed an Act some 28 years ago prescribing the ages of 16 and 16, respectively. In New Zealand they are the same. In 1942 Tasmania made the ages 18 and 16, with the same provision as in this Bill regarding the Minister's consent in special cases. In Western Australia the ages are 18 and 16, in France 18 and 15, Germany 21 and 16, Norway 20 and 18, Japan, surprising to relate, 21 and 15, Turkey 15 and 15, Spain 16 and 14.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I have no figures in relation to those States.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Have you any statistics on the varying age of puberty in those countries?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—No. Mr. Condon said that divorce does not apply only to young people. While I was in London I went to the House of Commons and obtained some

statistics which I am sure will be of great interest on this point. They are as follows:—

Age.	Rates of divorce per 1,000. 5 years.	5-10 years.	10-15 years.	15-20 years.
Under 17½ ..	2.1	19.2	13.4	12.4
17½-22½	2.1	9.1	6.0	4.7
22-27	2.2	5.2	3.2	2.3
27-32	1.7	4.3	2.2	1.7
32-37	1.4	3.2	1.7	nil
42-47	1.2	—	—	—

Those figures seem to indicate that the older the ages at marriage the lower the percentage of divorce, and in a very striking degree the reverse as to the under 17½ age group; the percentage is extremely high and that is the point I emphasize.

I was forcibly struck by an article in the *Advertiser* of August 23 regarding a 13-year-old bride in New York who said that her 18 year old husband had spanked her and she had refused to go back to him. As it has quite a bearing on the subject under discussion I think it worth quoting. It was as follows:—

Karl Ritter, in the Baltimore Court, sought to have Charlette Ann Kuchta Ritter returned on a contention her mother was restraining the girl against her will.

The case was dismissed.

Ritter, a painter, said they were married on April 22, after giving his age as 22 and hers at 19. She left him on July 12.

The girl told the judge: "I saw my friends getting married and having babies and all. He promised me I would have furniture and he would give me the pay cheque every week. I didn't think it would be anything like this."

"You know what marriage means, don't you?" the judge asked.

"I didn't know as much as I thought I did," she replied.

That applies to many and I would suggest in the interests of our young people that the present age limit should be raised to 18 and 16 years respectively.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—This Bill appears before us again and I intend to support the second reading because I feel that marriageable age of 12 or 13 for a girl is, in the words of Sir Arthur Rymill, "ridiculous"; indeed it deserves a much stronger condemnation, and is something that should have been examined many years ago. Although the Bill sets out the marriageable age of a girl as 16 I think that, with our present educational trends, most girls at that age are still attending school. Under this measure they could be both schools girls and married women. One could contend, perhaps, that even the age of 16 is too young for a girl to enter into the contract of marriage and assume the responsibilities of married life, for most girls at that age are but completing their secondary education and beginning to enter social life and enjoy all forms of sport. The same can be said of a lad of 18. Although some girls of this age may feel that there is a grandeur about marriage they soon find after the ceremony that they wish to continue their social activities, so I feel that the time is ripe for an alteration of the law.

However, I have one or two criticisms of the Bill, particularly in relation to new subsection 42A(2). As I understand it, where two persons are ineligible to contract a marriage because of the ages prescribed in subsection 1 the Minister may give his consent. As the law stands it is necessary for the parents to give consent under the age of 21, and the Bill still provides that the parents' consent shall be obtained under the ages of 18 and 16. However, where it is not forthcoming the Minister may give his consent. Although that may appear to be all right I believe that parents are the best judges of what is in the interests of their children. A girl of 16 is still only a child and surely the best judges of what is in her interests are the parents themselves. Parents bring children into the world, rear them, educate them and do everything for their upbringing, only to find that if the children want to marry their authority can be overruled.

I suppose there have always been circumstances under which marriages should be entered into, such as poor home life created by the habits of parents or when a girl has made a mistake, and sometimes through pique the parents might withhold consent when it should be given. However, I do not think a Minister should have the power to over-ride the wishes of parents. There is no provision requiring the Minister to conduct an investigation or to consult the parents before giving consent. He would act on reports from his officers who would inquire into each case, but placing the burden on him is not in the best interests of the State.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—It is a responsibility he has had for years under the old Act.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I know that, but I think this power should be vested in a magistrate in Chambers, who should be in full consultation with the parents of both parties. After a thorough investigation he would be in a position to give his consent or withhold it. Recently a 16-year-old girl in Brisbane wanted to marry a man of 21. In this case there was no necessity for the marriage; the girl's home life left nothing to be desired, her parents had

lavished everything on her and provided her with a good education, but she still wanted to marry. The parents told her she was too young to have the responsibility of married life or to make up her own mind, and asked her to wait a couple of years when, if she was still of the same mind, they would permit the marriage. The girl, perhaps a little headstrong, said she was going to marry, and made application to a magistrate for permission, which was granted because the magistrate felt that a girl of 16 was quite as capable of loving as a person of 50. That might be quite true, but a girl of that age might be infatuated by a man because of her inexperience, and might feel that he is the only man in the world. Under those circumstances I do not think any person should have the right to over-ride the parents' wishes. If the parents do not consent, an application can be made under this Bill to the Minister, who may or may not give consent. I appreciate that new section 42a (4) provides that nothing in the section shall affect any requirement as to the consent of parents or guardians under section 26 of the Act.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—But that does not mean anything.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—I think it does.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It means that nothing in this Bill will over-ride what has been necessary in the past, and consent of parents has been necessary in the past, but if the Bill goes through in its present form the parents' consent will definitely be over-ridden, and there may be circumstances under which that consent should be given.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—No matter what the parents say when the children are under 18 or 16, they can be over-ridden by the Minister.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Exactly. Members might ask what will happen to children who have no parents or guardians. In matters relating to these children I suggest that an application should be made to a magistrate in chambers who, after making necessary inquiries, could give or refuse permission. I believe that the marriage age must be amended, but I do not agree with the wording of the Bill, and in Committee stages I intend to move that the words "the Minister" in new section 42a (2) be deleted and the words "a magistrate in chambers, after consultation with the parents or guardians of the parties" be inserted in lieu thereof. If that could be agreed to it would be a better provision than the present new subsection. It would meet all the circumstances I have mentioned and would be in the best interests of all parties. I support the second reading.

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

COUNCIL BY-LAWS: POULTRY KEEPING.

The notice of motion having been called on and the Hon. E. Anthoney being temporarily absent from the Chamber—

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I move that the notice of motion standing in the name of the Hon. E. Anthoney be adjourned until September 4.

The Hon. E. Anthoney having returned to the Chamber—

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 1) I move that the notice of motion standing in my name be made an order of the day for September 18.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—On a point of order, Mr. President, the Attorney-General has moved that this motion be adjourned. You cannot take anything else.

The President put the Attorney-General's motion and declared that the noes had it. The Hon. F. J. Condon called for a division and the bells were rung.

While the bells were ringing—

The PRESIDENT—Standing Order 73 states that a notice of motion called on in its order and not moved shall lapse. The notice of motion was not moved at the time it should have been and automatically lapses, and therefore the division is called off.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I point out that you, Sir, took the motion of the Attorney-General. Unfortunately, Mr. Anthoney was absent; the Attorney-General tried to secure the adjournment, and you put his motion to the Council and declared it negatived on the voices, therefore, I called for a division. With respect, Sir, you cannot go back on that.

The PRESIDENT—I took the Minister's motion in error. The Standing Orders lay down that a notice of motion called on in its order and not moved shall lapse. That is very clear, and I am going to stand by it.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I think that is entirely wrong. Mr. Anthoney was out of the Chamber, and when the motion was called on you, Sir, gave the decision which you usually give. The Attorney-General moved that the matter be adjourned. That was negatived on the

voices and therefore I cannot see how we can go against that. With great respect, Sir, I move that your ruling be disagreed with.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I second the motion to disagree with your ruling, Sir. You accepted the motion moved by the Attorney-General and decided on the voices, and on that the Leader of the Opposition and other members in this Chamber called for a division. With very great respect I submit that in effect the Standing Order that was mentioned will have no force in view of the fact that the business before the Chair was the motion moved by the Attorney-General.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The position in which we find ourselves is due to an unfortunate situation which arose because the prior debate ended earlier than was thought, and Mr. Anthoney was not in the Chamber at the time. In order to assist him, I moved that this matter should be adjourned for consideration tomorrow. My own view is that the House must be in charge of its own business, and if the House as a whole decides that business can be adjourned until tomorrow, I feel that is the correct procedure for it to adopt. That was the basis of the motion which I moved.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 1)—Mr. President, it seems that this is rather a regrettable incident. I was not present when it began, but as I see it the House is in charge of its own procedure at all times, and if it wishes to do anything which is contrary to Standing Orders it cannot do so without the Standing Orders being suspended. As I see the position, you, Sir, have quoted a very definite Standing Order which is a ruling in this matter. That Standing Order has not been suspended, and therefore I think the Council would be absolutely wrong if it voted against your ruling, which is in accordance with Standing Orders. I ask the Council to support your ruling.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I very much regret that I was temporarily absent from the Chamber at the time. I draw attention to Standing Order 159 which states:—

In the absence of the member in charge thereof an order of the day may be moved or postponed by any other member, but may not be discharged except on motion after notice.

The PRESIDENT—I point out to the honourable member that the Standing Order he quoted refers to an order of the day and not a notice of motion.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Mr. President, I respect your ruling. I have said repeatedly that it does not matter whether you are right or wrong, the majority of the members of this Council will agree to your ruling on principle. That does not alter the fact that I think it is entirely wrong in this instance. It should not be a principle of this Council to agree to a President's ruling purely on Party politics. A President can be wrong, and I think you, Sir, are wrong on this occasion. We can rely on Standing Orders, but as a matter of loyalty your friends always stick to you, Sir. Mr. Anthoney was absent, temporarily, and the Attorney-General, in order to meet his wishes, moved that the motion be adjourned. You, Sir, then put the Attorney-General's motion and I said "Aye" and called for a division. After that, I do not think you have any right to raise the question at all, and I say with great respect that you are entirely wrong. It does not matter to me which way the vote goes, but at least I think I am sticking up for the traditions and Standing Orders of Parliament.

The Council divided on the question that the President's ruling be disagreed with:—

Ayes (4).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, F. J. Condon (teller), and A. J. Shard.

Noes (13).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, C. R. Cudmore, L. H. Densley, N. L. Jude, A. J. Melrose, Sir Frank Perry, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, C. R. Story and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.58 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 4, at 2.15 p.m.