LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, October 15, 1958.

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

QUESTIONS.

TRANSFORMER STATION AT PROSPECT.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on October 8 regarding the site for a transformer station at Prospect?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I submitted the honourable member's question to the Trust and have received the following particulars. The land was purchased in 1950 to cater for the ultimate development of the area before it was built up. A temporary transformer station has been on the site since 1952. A corner block is necessary to give access and exit for overhead lines and to facilitate the movement of large trucks. This area was investigated for over four years before it was decided to construct the sub-station on this site. Owing to the distribution of load, variation of site is limited. The policy of the Trust is to keep these areas neat and tidy and plant trees and hedges. To meet long term needs of consumers the Trust's policy is to acquire suitable sites for sub-stations ahead of development.

SPEED LIMIT PAST ROAD WORKS.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on September 23 regarding a speed limit past road works?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The Parliamentary Draftsman has prepared a drafting clause on this matter as requested by the State Traffic Committee, but it is not proposed to introduce any Bill until the committee and the Government have had an opportunity to confer and consider the draft clause.

INTERSTATE DESTITUTE PERSONS RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from House of Assembly without amendment.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from House of Assembly without amendment.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from House of Assembly without amendment.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from House of Assembly without amendment.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1096.)

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—This, to me, is like turning back a few pages for a few years in this Chamber, because the Hon. Mr. Condon and I were protagonists last time this matter was considered in detail in this Chamber, in 1942. The honourable member has introduced a short Bill containing only two points, compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. As always, he has given us details, particulars, and facts. I was glad to hear him, amongst his other remarks, re-echo my own suggestion earlier this session that this Chamber should be enlarged in numbers. No doubt other people will give that matter thought in due course.

I thought the honourable member rather spoilt his speech by suggesting, in reply to an interjection, that the 1942 legislation which made voting compulsory for the House of Assembly was introduced by a Liberal and Country League Government, whereas it was not a Government measure at all, but one introduced by a private member, admittedly a Liberal and Country League member. It was a complicated measure and produced the most exciting debates and divisions that have occurred since I have been a member. I think one or two divisions resulted in a vote of 18 on each side and had to be decided by the Chairman of Committees, while others were decided by one vote. The result of all that excitement was that when the Bill arrived in this Council some provisions applied to both Houses and some only to the House of Assembly.

It was then that the Hon. Mr. Condon and I came into the picture. I moved, firstly, that it be only "Assembly" in clause 3, if I remember rightly. You, Sir, will remember this matter because you were Leader of the Government Party in this Chamber at the time. Following an objection by Mr. Condon, I postponed my amendment until after the honourable member had moved his, which was exactly

what he seeks today, namely, compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. The Council, having considered the matter, decided against him in 1942.

Little can be said about this, because either one is for it or against it. I have not changed my mind at all, but some members in this Council today were not here in 1942 and they, of course, are entitled to express their opinions. It was suggested by Mr. Condon that the Liberal and Country League had decided in favour of compulsory voting for the Legislative Council, but there is nothing in the constitution, principles or platform of the Liberal and Country League which supports compulsory enrolment or compulsory voting for this Chamber. It is, therefore, not a question of what other people think about it, but a question for us to decide.

I have always felt that voting, like education, is a privilege and not something that should be compulsory. It may be necessary to compel very young children to receive education, but when people are grown up they have been provided with sufficient education for them to read and know what is going on, and it should be entirely for them to decide whether they wish to vote and, if so, for whom they wish to vote.

I took a definite stand on this matter in 1942. As I have pointed out, the issue then was one introduced in a private member's Bill, not a Government one, and Parliament decided against both compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. I have heard nothing that could possibly make me change my mind on this question and, therefore, without further ado, I ask the Council to vote against this measure.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore is running true to form by opposing the measure, but he seems to forget that Australia was in the forefront in introducing the ballot box. Prior to representative Government some parts of Australia had the old style of election that operated in England at borough elections when voting was by a show of hands. In order to meet the desires of those who wanted to be heard in Parliament, Australia gave the lead and introduced what we know as "voting by ballot." That was a notable issue and is something about which Australians can be proud. Honourable members know there is much derision from some people outside regarding this Chamber. It is no use our being like the ostrich, trying to bury our heads in the sand and saying, "We are safely ensconced in this place and while the present voting system continues we can hold our seats." That is not a true reflection of democracy. Labor believes that, because of the system of Government operating in totalitarian countries, an opportunity should be offered to those South Australians qualified to vote in order to express their will freely in electing their representatives to either House of Parliament. Because of that the Leader of the Opposition has presented this Bill so that we can get a reflection of public opinion and permit them to vote for this House.

In his speech the Leader of the Opposition said that compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting operated for the Upper House in Tasmania and Victoria. That is true, but, prior to the introduction of compulsory voting for the Upper House in Victoria, over a period of years that State did not have responsible Government, for a Government would be in office for some months, sometimes only for a week. I think every honourable member agrees that the introduction of compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council in Victoria resulted, for the first time in a number of years, in the election of a stable Government in that State. The South Australian Constitution provides that any candidate offering for election to this Chamber must not be under 30 years of age and must have certain qualifications such as the paying of rent or the owning of property, or he must be a returned serviceman from either world war. The Bill does not alter any of those qualifications, but in full measure affords these people the opportunity to express their wishes as to their representatives in this Chamber.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—They have it now.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In a nebulous way. The honourable member knows that for South Australian State elections compulsory voting operates for the House of Assembly, but eight out of 10 people who may be qualified to vote for that House are not afforded the opportunity to vote for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—Whose fault is that?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I think it is our responsibility. We cannot uphold an institution when the will of the people is denied. The honourable member must agree that if we are to retain our Australian way of life and have a free Parliamentary institution we should open every avenue whereby the

public may avail themselves of the opporunity to maintain a system that every honourable member desires should be maintained.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Sir Collier Cudmore compels me, under stress of fine, to vote for the House of Assembly.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I can see no valid reason for opposition to the Bill because if we believe what is said in this Council, and I consider that every honourable member does, we should accept the proposal submitted and thus prove to the outside public that we desire to see the Australian democracy work. In view of happenings in other parts of the world where free countries have gone down like ninepins, it is our responsibility and duty to uphold the traditions of democracy, and the only way we can do that is to let democracy speak, not to attempt to subdue its opinions. The only way that democracy can speak is through the elected representatives in Parliament. Accordingly, I support the Bill and hope that other honourable members will view the issue in the same way and thus uphold the dignity of our Parliamentary institution.

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

WEST TORRENS CORPORATION BY-LAW: CARTING OF HEAVY MATERIALS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. E. Anthoney—

That By-law No. 54 of the Corporation of the City of West Torrens to regulate and control the carting of heavy materials, made on February 25, 1958, and laid on the table of this Council on June 17, 1958, be disallowed.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1096.)

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—The by-law under review refers to the carting of heavy materials in certain areas of the West Torrens Corporation area. The Subordinate Legislation Committee, having carefully considered the matter, found it was not quite in line with certain other motions for disallowance discussed in this House recently. In speaking to it, Sir Collier Cudmore said the matter should be carefully considered. In the meantime the Government has carefully considered it and I personally inspected the area, and, having regard to the opinions submitted to this House by members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I advise honourable members it is the Government's intention to support the motion.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1165.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—There is no dearth of material for comment in the Bill. The interesting feature is that the sum involved has been presented under 79 different headings, the details of which were amplified by the Chief Secretary. Those 79 headings reveal the wide ramifications of present-day Governmental and semi-Governmental administration and responsibility, which extend to every sphere of our social and economic set-up and affect the well-being of every member of the community. I commend the Chief Secretary for the detailed information he gave on the various items, particularly those affecting his department. As I listened to his speech, I was impressed with the time and attention that must be given in considering the allocation of the sums involved and in making those allocations to the institutions on the basis of their needs and requirements, which are always expanding. That is a natural corollary that arises from the State's progressive development over the past decade from a minor position in the Commonwealth partnership to a major one. It is not my intention to traverse a wide field in making my contribution at this stage—not because, as I have already said, of any lack of material for the purpose. Despite the substantial amount of the appropriation, one would have no difficulty in putting forward good cases for expenditure in excess of the amounts provided. Indeed, I doubt whether the stage will ever be reached when allocations are sufficient for our needs. As I stated earlier, expansion increases demand and, whilst the Budgets of today make those of earlier years sink into insignificance, those of years to come will no doubt increase in proportion.

Mr. Condon, in addressing himself to the Bill yesterday, opened on an optimistic note. It was an optimism born of the hope that this would be the last occasion on which he would make his contribution to this debate from his side of the Council. Later, however (unfortunately, I thought) the honourable member's optimism waned somewhat as he proceeded with his remarks, but I venture to say that, in the remote possibility of his prediction coming true and his occupying a seat on this side of the Council, he would give to it the same assiduous attention that he always gives to matters now under his control. His optimism waned when he made a rather gloomy prediction of what

might be happening—and, if not, of what was already happening—in some larger towns, particularly Port Pirie.

No member is not concerned about the position developing in some of our industrial areas, and particularly in that town. It has been brought about, of course, by a fall in the price of commodities and of the metals produced at Broken Hill. A contributing factor has been the necessity to curtail employment in Broken Hill, which has reacted on Port Pirie where the ore is treated. It has also had a detrimental effect on our railway earnings. One must sit up and take notice of what is happening there.

However, whilst I admit that I cannot at this stage come forward with some grandiose scheme that will put matters right overnight, I feel sure that, by a concentration of effort to create other avenues of employment, those who have been dispensed with in these industries will find occupation elsewhere. I know a legitimate objection is that these people have spent the greater part of their lives in the town, established their families there and lived to see the rising generation establish their families in turn. They take root in the neighbourhood and it is not easy for them and those associated with them to move out just by force of circumstances over which they have little control.

Previously this Session, I expressed myself on decentralization, so I do not propose to cover that ground again. I do not know that I could add any more now to what I said then, although I admit it is a matter that looms largely in this problem of re-establishing declining industries. Despite the curtailment of employment and the other circumstances I have mentioned, it was pleasing to hear Mr. Condon admit that in Port Pirie there had been no decline in population over the relevant period. I shall not suggest that the population is greatly in excess of what it used to be years ago, because of course, that is a false argument, but over the last 12 months, in spite of the Broken Hill position, the railway earnings and the other incidentals that are all a part of the present picture at Port Pirie, the population has remained much the same. The inference is that the people who have lost their employment in the established industries there have found occupations elsewhere.

I now refer to the care, well-being and assimilation of the aborigines into the white population which have occupied a good deal of attention recently, and much criticism has been levelled at the authorities for what some people claim is their half-hearted manner of approach to this problem. We all realize that it is not easy; it bristles with all sorts of difficulties. Anybody who has had experience in the areas where the aborigines are in fairly large numbers realizes that a vast gap has to be bridged before we can assimilate, or even start to assimilate, many aborigines into our ordinary communal life. The criticism of what has been done is unfounded and unjustified, and leads me to think that those people who have come forward and virtually declared that *little or nothing* has been done have not considered it necessary to acquaint themselves with the position. If honourable members are sufficiently interested, they can peruse the present Estimates, where they will find just what has been done, is being done, and is proposed to be done in the current year.

It is noted that some £374,000 has been set aside for the aborigines generally. Homes, missions, medical services and so forth all come under that heading. According to the Aborigines Department report, that amount exceeds last year's payment by no less than £110,000, which is a lot of money in anybody's coin. Surely, when the authorities are prepared to make that contribution, bearing in mind all that is involved, they could at least expect acclamation instead of criticism.

Another problem associated with the aborigines, of which I have seen something myself, concerns those centres where they come into contact with the white population and work on a similar basis to that of the white people. Particularly is this apparent in two centres of population, admittedly not very big—at our opal fields in the north at Stewart's Range and at Andamooka. Unfortunately, one of the problems associated with the assimilation of our aborigines is the attitude adopted by certain white people. There is some evidence that the aborigines who are working as opal gougers or opal miners are being exploited by people who, one has a right to think, would be the last to take advantage of them. Unfortunately, human nature is such that some people are always prepared to take advantage of anybody who perhaps is not in a position to take the care of himself that he should or should be expected to. Assistance has been given and the Aborigines Department, and the Government through that department, have appointed people to act as semi-wardens with oversight over the native opal miners and

transactions associated with the sale of their products. In this way they are endeavouring to see that they get a fair deal. However, many well-intentioned people desire to do all they possibly can to raise our native population to a higher standard so that some day—maybe a long way off—they may be assimilated into our communal life.

Agriculture is now going through a transitional phase, which arises from expanding knowledge and techniques in land usage. An interesting feature of this is the attention being displayed by younger members in the agricultural community, and a desire to make use of, and have technical knowledge on, the technical side of their education. In the older generation there was an inclination to look askance at any technical or scientific suggestions in the practice of agriculture. When the application of superphosphate was first introduced—I think on Yorke Peninsula—there was a good deal of criticism and, indeed, some adverse comment about the use of this artificial fertilizer and the detrimental effect it would have. That is simply a demonstration of the old conservative spirit which seemed to be inherent in this occupation at that time. It was not long, however, before practical demonstrations gave ample proof of the wisdom of adopting this latest development.

I was very interested indeed to learn recently, through an article appearing in our papers, that something is being done to organize farming on more scientific and economic lines, and I think there is a wide field for something of that nature. The Department of Agriculture is setting out a new Government plan aimed at providing answers to the questions—"What will it pay me to do?", "What crops will give me best returns?", "Will it pay me to run more sheep and fewer other livestock?", "What implements will I need?", and "What will the cost be?" This all adds up to a question of economic production. Many farms today are over-capitalized. Farming machinery is very expensive, some implements costing up to £2,000, and probably more. When it is realized that they may be used for only two or three weeks in the year it will be seen that the farmer has a large amount of capital lying idle for the greater part of the year, but it is on this capital outlay that his cost of production is based. I think, therefore, that this matter will be taken up by our farming community, particularly the younger generation, and although it may take a long time I feel sure that it will become the established practice in our agricultural community.

Another matter to which I have referred on previous occasions, and make no excuse for mentioning now, is the amount provided for the Highways and Local Government Department for expenditure on roads. I was at first somewhat concerned at the amount set down, £378,979, and thought when I heard it read out, "That will not go far." However, on second thoughts I realized that under the Highways Act the funds available to the department are paid direct to it, and that the funds available for 1957-58 are over £8,000,000, which is a sum nearer requirements, although still probably inadequate for all that we want to do. Incidentally, that is an increase of over £500,000 on the previous year. This is a noticeable feature throughout the Bill. I have not made a detailed study of all the figures, but I venture the opinion that many sums set down show an increase over the previous year's figures. Commonwealth grants for highways are higher by £460,000, and grants to local authorities for construction and maintenance of roads total £1,678,000. The relationship between the Highways Department and local government in South Australia, as far as my knowledge goes, is a very happy one. There is a desire for co-operation between the people responsible for spending the money and they have an appreciation of the engineer's knowledge and advice, which is readily available.

Despite these substantial amounts, however, there is need for even more funds, for many main and arterial roads still lack an all-weather surface. During my association with local government in the earlier days we felt that when the brattenizing system was evolved, we had solved our problems for some time to come, and so we had. Those were the horse and buggy days; a model T-Ford was about the acme of motor transport and a two-ton truck about the limit in heavier vehicles. Under those conditions our earth roads stood up very well and the construction and maintenance costs were comparatively light. We have passed far beyond those conditions now. We have heavier and faster motor vehicles which are playing a very big part in the increasing need for expenditure on our roads and for more solid construction.

The districts in which I am more particularly interested and with which I have a wide association, are those traversed by Eyre Highway, and I again make a plea that something further be done in connection with it. It is becoming

more and more important with the development of Whyalla, the increased population and the demands for the products of Eyre Peninsula, a district which incidentally is developing very rapidly. Eyre Highway extends from Port Augusta to Eucla, a distance of 636 miles, but only 225 miles is within the boundaries of the four district councils concerned. I put forward for the consideration of the Minister of Local Government an emphatic plea that further consideration be given to raising funds that will permit of the sealing of that portion of the highway that lies within those district council boundaries. I am not asking for the whole 636 miles to be done. Frankly, I am not much concerned about the people who may use it once a year or once in a lifetime in travelling to the western State, but I am concerned about the people who use it daily and depend upon it as their means of transport, not only to the city, but in their own localities for the marketing of their products.

It may be of interest to note that in the last five years a very considerable sum has been spent by the four district councils concerned in the construction and maintenance of that road. Although these dirt roads provide very good travelling when they are in good condition, if one happens to strike them in wet weather in mid-summer they are a menace and they are a continual drain down which we pour considerable sums of money. I endeavoured to get figures on this from the four councils, but unfortunately have received them from only three, and these show that in the past five years no less than £123,000 has been spent by them on maintenance. Whilst admitting that even a sealed road needs some maintenance, the amount now being spent on the maintenance of dirt roads would go a long way towards meeting the interest on the Loan money required to make this an all-weather highway.

As members know, progress has been made with the Lincoln Highway. I had an opportunity to inspect that highway only a few weeks ago and was agreeably surprised and pleased with what was revealed by the cement stabilizing method. It seemed to me that when that road finally gets its top coating it will stand up to the traffic demands for many years. Seeing that road convinced me that something similar must be done for the portion of Eyre Highway that I have mentioned. The completion of the Lincoln Highway is now appreciably nearer, and the time will come when a decision will have to be made about the plant and equipment being used on it. If that plant is removed from Eyre Peninsula without something being done about the portion of the Eyre Highway I have referred to, I assure members that we will hear about it. The people in that part feel very concerned about this matter; I think they have a very good case, and I support them, knowing the conditions that have prevailed.

I could discuss other matters that affect my district, but I am quite satisfied that everything possible is being done. We hear of a possible duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. That has been talked about for a considerable time, and the hope has been expressed that when the duplication is made some northern areas which at present have unsatisfactory water supplies will be considered. A remark was made by way of interjection—I think when Mr. Condon was speaking—concerning the way farmers had allowed their own local dams and tanks to go out of use when the pipeline came along. One of the reasons for that, of course, is the great increase in our stock carrying capacity. If honourable members are sufficiently interested they should have a look at the informative and useful pocket book published by the Chief Secretary, and they will find information on how our stock numbers have increased.

When the last figures were taken out we had a sheep population in South Australia of over 13,000,000, and there has also been a comparable increase in the number of cattle. Some local storages have become inadequate for carrying these increased numbers, and with the newer outlook in agricultural production even these figures may be surpassed. Therefore, the duplication of water supplies from the River Murray or any other source will be needed to those northern districts that require water. I support the Bill.

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

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Government has brought down this Bill, Sir, because of a recent decision by Mr. Justice

Mayo that section 127a of the Road Traffic Act, which prescribes the short right turn, does not apply to riders of motor cycles. That section has been in force for eight years. It has been generally accepted that it applies to motor cyclists, and there is no doubt that on the whole motor cyclists have conformed to the rule laid down in it. It would be a most unsatisfactory position if the law were as laid down by His Honor. There would be one rule for right hand turns by motor cyclists and a different rule for drivers of other vehicles. Thus considerable confusion might arise at intersections in a stream of traffic consisting of both motor cars and motor cycles. Motor cyclists have become accustomed to the short right turn, and this method has decided advantages over the old one.

It is not necessary in connection with this Bill to discuss the question whether the decision of Mr. Justice Mayo is correct in law or not. It is sufficient for the purpose of justifying this Bill that the judgment raises doubts on a matter of every day conduct, and that His Honor's interpretation of section 127a is contrary to the intention of the Government when it introduced the 1950 Bill, and the intention of Parliament when it passed that Bill. The judge's view of section 127a was arrived at by implications based on a comparison between that section and some other sections of the Act. Subsection (1) of section 127a lays it down that every driver of a vehicle must, when turning to the right, make the short turn and a separate subsection says that the same method must also be followed by riders of animals. The section does not say expressly that it applies to the rider of a motor cycle. There are, however, definitions in section 119 saying that the word "driver" means a person driving or riding a vehicle or animal, and the word "vehicle" includes a motor cycle. Some of the other sections in the Act which apply both to vehicles and animals refer to drivers and riders. His Honor thought that there was an inference to be drawn that section 127a did not apply to riders of motor cycles but only to riders of animals.

If this reasoning is correct it is possible that a number of other sections in Part VI of the Road Traffic Act which refer to drivers or driving vehicles and do not expressly mention riders will be held to be limited in the same way. This would be a highly inconvenient result, because some important traffic rules would not apply to motor cycles. Having regard to Mr. Justice Mayo's decision, Sir, and also the possibility that doubts may be raised in future about the application of other parts of the Act, it is desirable to deal with the matter by legislation. In the first place it provides that references to drivers and driving will be deemed to include references to riders and riding unless the express language of a particular provision indicates that that provision does not apply to riders and riding.

If this amendment is passed, Sir, it will not be open to the Court to limit the operation of a particular provision of the Act by implications drawn from the language of other provisions. Thus, for example, a provision applying generally to drivers of vehicles and which does not expressly state that motor cycles are excluded will apply to motor cycles. Secondly, the Bill declares that the principal Act will have effect as if the amendments made by the Bill had been in the principal Act at the time when it was passed. This will ensure that motor cyclists who have followed the accepted interpretation of the Act in the past will not thereby be liable to be held guilty of any offence or of negligence. It is a retrospective provision but is necessary and harmless and will not disturb any established rights.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It ratifies the amending River Murray Waters Agreement by which the claim of this State to a share of the Snowy Mountains water is accepted by the other parties to the Agreement. The Agreement was signed on the 11th of last month and was the result of nearly three years' difficult and complicated negotiations between South Australia on the one hand and the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales on the other.

It was early in 1956 that the Government first learned that New South Wales and Victoria proposed to share between themselves the water which would be diverted into the Murray from the Snowy by the Snowy Mountains Authority, and that South Australia was to be excluded from any share in this water. The Government immediately took the matter up with the Commonwealth. On February 27, 1956, we wrote to the Prime Minister pointing out that the Snowy Mountains project had been

financed from revenue and that South Australia as a contributor would expect to receive a fair share of the water. We asked to be allowed to see the draft agreement before it was signed. This request, though reiterated from time to time, was consistently refused. It was not until the Snowy Mountains Agreement was signed more than 18 months later that South Australia received a copy of it. The Agreement confirmed the information which the Government had previously received. It provided that the Snowy Mountains waters were to be shared equally between New South Wales and Victoria. It also provided that the River Tooma, one of the tributaries above the Hume Reservoir whose waters had to be taken into account in working out South Australia's share in a time of restriction, was to be diverted from the river by the Snowy Mountains Authority without any provision for compensating South Australia for loss of its share of this water.

From the outset of the negotiations South Australia has claimed that if Snowy Mountains water is diverted into the Murray above Albury it will become part of the Murray and must be taken into account in working out South Australia's allocation of water in a time of restriction. The Crown Solicitor, Mr. Chamberlain, strongly held this view and he was supported by Mr. D. I. Menzies, Q.C., recently appointed as a Justice of the High Court. The Parliamentary Draftsman also advised the Government to the same effect. Sir Garfield Barwick, however, who was retained by the Commonwealth, took the opposite view. He advised that New South Wales or Victoria could put water into the Murray anywhere and take it out lower down. They could, as it were, use the Murray as an instrument for storing, transporting and delivering an independently owned volume of water not really forming part of the river.

It is not necessary for me now to tell again the long story of the correspondence, inspections and conferences which took place in an endeavour by the parties to the Snowy Mountains scheme to satisfy the South Australian Government that it was not prejudicially affected by the Snowy Mountains Agreement. All that I need say is that two years elapsed without any satisfactory proposals being made for assuring to us a share of the Snowy water; and the Government finally decided that it had no alternative but to commence an action in the High Court. Instructions were given to the Crown Solicitor and on the 17th April of this year a writ was issued. We claimed a declaration of South Australia's right to a share of the Snowy water and other remedies, the decision of which would raise the issue whether the Snowy Mountains scheme was constitutional.

After the issue of the writ negotiations and conferences continued and finally New South Wales and Victoria conceded the justice of the claims made by South Australia, and agreed to define our rights by the only effective method, that is, by an amendment of the River Murray Waters Agreement. They asked, however, that when the Agreement was being amended the existing provisions dealing with the allocation of the Murray waters in periods of restriction should be rescinded by mutual consent and that a new code of rules on this subject should be agreed to for the purpose of removing legal doubts and clarifying the rights of the parties. The South Australian Government had no objection to this. It was, indeed, a modest price to pay for the recognition and declaration of the rights that we were seeking to establish.

The Agreement, therefore, which is in the schedule to the Bill is a fairly long document because it re-writes the whole of clause 51 of the River Murray Waters Agreement, *i.e.*, the clause dealing with periods of restriction. The principal new matters in the clause can, however, be shortly stated:—

(1) The definition of "Murray water" in subclause (5) makes it clear that any waters coming into the River Murray and its tributaries above Albury by means of the permanent works of the Snowy Mountains Authority will be taken into account in working out the allocations of all the States, including South Australia, in a period of restriction.

(2) It provides that until the works of the Snowy Mountains Authority enable water diverted from the Tooma River to be replaced by Snowy water, the amount of water diverted from the Tooma by the Snowy Mountains works will be debited against New South Wales and Victoria and will be taken into account as Murray waters for the purpose of working out South Australia's allotment in a period of restriction.

(3) The definition of "Murray water" makes clear a point about which there was previously some doubt, namely, that all the tributaries of the Murray above Albury have to be taken into account in working out South Australia's allocation in a period of restriction.

(4) The clause contains a complete redraft of the provisions of the River Murray Waters Agreement which deal with the allocation of

water in a time of restriction. An important benefit to South Australia in this clause is that our right to a definite allocation of water for losses by evaporation, percolation, lockages, and dilution between Lake Victoria and the Murray Mouth is recognized. It is provided that in times of restriction the allowance for such losses will be separately computed and will be allowed to pass to South Australia in addition to the water allocated for use.

(5) At the request of New South Wales and Victoria their rights in respect of tributaries below Albury are set out in the amending Agreement in greater detail than previously. Under the principal Agreement both of these States retain their right to the waters of their tributaries below Albury during a period of restriction and, if either State permits a tributary to run into the Murray, it is entitled to take out the amount so contributed in addition to its normal share. It may be that in future this right will be more important to New South Wales and Victoria than it has been in the past because of works being done for storing water in the tributaries, and they are anxious that the provision dealing with tributaries should be stated again in a form more acceptable to them. I do not think that the re-statement makes any difference to the substance of the provision which merely says that, if a State puts into the River Murray water which it need not have contributed, it can take out a corresponding amount at any point.

(6) The formula by which the amount of Murray water available for use is divided among the States is not altered. It will still be in the proportion of approximately 5, 5, 3, but, as a result of including the Snowy Mountains water in the amount to which the formula is applied, South Australia will, of course, receive a much larger quantity in a period of restriction. In normal years also the Snowy waters will greatly increase the volume of water flowing into South Australia and thus assist in flushing the river without adding materially to the flood danger.

It is, however, in a period of restriction that the greatest benefits will accrue and on this subject I will quote some paragraphs from a report made by the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Dridan, who is the representative of this State on the River Murray Waters Commission.

South Australia would receive approximately the following quantities of water for use during a year similar to 1914-15.

(*a*) Without Snowy water—337,000 acre feet.
(*b*) With Snowy water—453,000 acre feet.

These figures assume that there would be no restrictions from May to September inclusive and that restrictions would apply from October to April inclusive. The figures indicate a benefit to South Australia of 116,000 acre feet and this represents the actual benefit during the irrigation season, *i.e.*, October to April inclusive.

Considering the irrigation season only, the position would be:—

(*a*) Without Snowy water—203,000 acre feet.
(*b*) With Snowy water—319,000 acre feet.

Therefore, the Snowy would have the effect of increasing the quantity available for use by South Australia during the irrigation season (which is also the season of maximum demand for other purposes) from 203,000 acre feet to 319,000 acre feet—an increase of 116,000 acre feet, or 57 per cent. South Australia's present usage of water from the Murray during the irrigation period in a drought year is approximately 190,000 acre feet.

If we are assured of 319,000 acre feet in a drought year (irrigation season), I am of the opinion that development could be placed somewhat in excess of this amount on the assumption that a 10 per cent cut could be made in a drought year if necessary. This would mean that South Australia's use of Murray water during the October-April period could be placed on the basis of 354,000 acre feet in a normal year.

Speaking in broad terms an assurance of a share of Snowy water would mean that South Australia could double its present usage of River Murray water without running any risk of serious shortages during a year of drought.

Further local reservoirs could be developed to add to the supply to Adelaide and nearby localities, these being the raising of Mount Bold, a new reservoir on the Onkaparinga and a new reservoir on the Torrens. Between them these new sources should add about 6,000 million gallons a year to the assured annual water resources, *i.e.*, sufficient to meet the needs of a population of 150,000 people. This does not include South Para (completed) or Myponga (under construction). In addition to meeting the needs of the new oil refinery these reservoirs will meet the needs of 120,000 people.

From what I have said it will be clear that when this Agreement is ratified by all the Parliaments concerned, the claims which South Australia has made and insisted on continuously for nearly three years, will be effectively granted to the substantial benefit of the State.

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

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1167.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—This Bill contains two major provisions, the repeal of section 14 of the Police Offences Act and the provision of a new type of offence not

previously embodied in the consolidated Act. I support the second reading and agree with the repeal of section 14 which undoubtedly was enacted for the purposes of protecting the Australian aborigine from being exploited and sponged upon by white people. When the section was written into the 1953 Act, the reason given then was that it was very difficult to secure a conviction against people who were selling liquor to aborigines. The intention went a good deal further than that and had for its purpose the protection of the aborigines within the whole of the State. Section 14 of the 1953 Act reads as follows:—

(1) Any person who, not being an aboriginal native of Australia, or the child of an aboriginal native of Australia, without reasonable excuse habitually consorts with any aboriginal native of Australia shall be guilty of an offence—

The penalty was a fine of £50 or imprisonment for three months—

(2) In this section the expression "aboriginal native of Australia" means any person being the issue of parents or grandparents at least one of whom is an aboriginal native of Australia of the full blood . . .

It is more or less a definition of "aborigine." What does "consorting" mean? For instance, in other sections of the Police Offences Act when proceedings have been brought before the court, a definition has been given by one judge, that it means "an association with and knowing the character of." Another definition given by the court has been "to have fellowship with, to keep company with."

Admittedly, the Act says, "without reasonable excuse," but here again we are faced with the question "what is a reasonable excuse?" and these things could lead us into trouble. It is difficult to define "reasonable excuse." For example, if a law provided that it was an offence for a person to stand under a tree in King William Street, and I stood under it on a hot day, would it be a reasonable excuse if I said I was standing there because it was hot and I liked the shade? When it becomes a question of interpreting law I prefer not to express an opinion. I understand there have been four prosecutions under this section since 1953 for non-aborigines consorting with aborigines, and in two cases there were convictions.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Is that sufficient reason for deleting this section?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Of itself that might not be sufficient, but I will deal with that point as I go along. The Aborigines Act contains provisions that cover most of these offences, and I feel that that Act could be used to achieve the same purpose as is sought to be achieved under section 14 of the Police Offences Act. I recall that at Victor Harbour there was a full-blooded aborigine who was held in respect by the local residents and was employed by the civic authorities. Because a workmate drove his car to work and offered to give the aborigine a ride to work and back home he was warned by a police officer that, under section 14, he was committing a breach of the Act and that he was liable to a penalty for consorting. No doubt this police officer was within his rights, for had he failed to give this warning someone in higher authority might have brought him to book for not taking action.

There was a fair amount of adverse press and other comment about the case at the time, and suggestions that this sort of thing ought not to occur. Let us take the point a little further. Many of our workshops employ full-blooded aborigines who are good workmen. Some of our natives were members of the fighting forces during the last war and proved themselves valiant men who played an important part in the protection of our own and other democratic countries during that world upheaval. We have an aboriginal community in our metropolitan area and to all intents and purposes they are assimilated. Yet if the next-door neighbour, a white woman, habitually talks to a black woman over the fence she is committing an offence under the Act. Again, in the northern parts of the State many aborigines are employed on our sheep and cattle stations in company with white people. Our aborigines are nomads; they have the walk-about instinct. Their mode of living is, perhaps, unique in the world. They do not form villages and build huts and lead the village type of life, but while they are employed on stations they are in close contact all the time with white people.

We have been urged for some time to make an attempt to assimilate our natives. To achieve that we must be able to associate with them and they with us, and I suggest that, as the Act stands, we cannot do so without committing an offence if we are unable to offer a "reasonable excuse." A petition signed by some 7,000 persons was presented to the Government suggesting that section 14 be repealed. Surely many of those people would have first-hand experience and knowledge of just how this section could operate. While the Act remains in its present form it is impossible to do things that we are requested to do in respect of our aborigines as a civilized democratic country. Instead of the protection which it

was at first thought section 14 would afford it has proved to have just the reverse effect. I feel, as the Minister said he felt in introducing the Bill, that it is worth a trial, and if there is still need to protect the aboriginal female against consorting, action can be taken under the Aborigines Act.

Clause 4 deals with another type of offence, namely, creating a false belief as to events calling for police action, and the penalty proposed is £100 or imprisonment for one year. Unfortunately there have been instances where some action should have been allowed to take place against the perpetrators and in which undoubtedly the perpetrators themselves had no idea of what could have followed. A married man, the father of children, feigned a disappearance by hitting upon the novel idea of making it appear that he had been washed off the rocks on our southern coast. The man's clothes and other gear were left on the rocks and people immediately believed that he had been swept out to sea and drowned. With the idea of finding the body if possible, various people, in an attempt to do a humane act and a kindness to the man's family, joined in the search, and in consequence two lives were lost.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—Those people did not conduct a search at the request of the police.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am aware of that; they tried to do a humane act and a kindness to the family of the man who had supposedly been washed off the rocks and drowned. I know the two men who were killed had not been requested by any authority, police or otherwise, to join in the search, but did so voluntarily. They would not have lost their lives if this person had not feigned a disappearance.

In another instance, although no life was lost, the State was put to a considerable amount of trouble and expense. I refer to the man who drove his motor car into the River Torrens. The car was found in the river, and the impression was created in people's minds that the driver of the car had been drowned. The man disappeared, and perhaps he would have been "in smoke" longer had he not returned to South Australia on business for his employer. He had gone to Queensland and, being a motor engineer by trade, had apparently obtained a good job there under an assumed name. On his return here he was recognized by a police officer, apprehended, and when questioned, he finally admitted who he was. Unfortunately, no action could be taken because at the time no offence had been committed. I draw honourable members' attention to the wording of clause 4 and the explanation given by the Minister in introducing this Bill. I stress the phraseology of that clause, particularly the words:—

. . . creating a belief that a felony or misdemeanour has been committed or that life has or may be lost or is endangered.

The Minister in his second reading explanation said:—

The clause makes it an offence to falsely represent by conduct that any crime has been committed or that life has been lost or endangered. The main difference between the new clause and section 62 is that the section applies to false verbal misrepresentations, whereas the new clause deals with false representations made by conduct. Another difference is that whereas the present Act applies to representations relating to any matter calling for police investigation, the Bill is now limited to representations concerning crimes, death, and danger to life.

I maintain that the Bill is not confined to "crimes, death and danger to life," unless the word "misdemeanour" indicates a crime which causes a death or a danger to life. Again, we come back to the interpretation of the word "misdemeanour." I maintain that there could be many interpretations of that word, and I feel that it is not confined only to those three particular things, as the Minister has suggested. The new section will act as a deterrent and prevent a recurrence of the unfortunate events that have occurred. People will think twice about creating such false beliefs when they know that it is a breach of the law and that, if and when they are caught, they can be dealt with under the Act.

My only other comment is on the penalty, which is a fine of £100 or imprisonment for 12 months. In some cases that penalty would probably be fitting, but for an ordinary misdemeanour it seems rather severe in comparison with other penalties in the Act. I know that discretion may be used, but I thought that a penalty of £50 would have been more uniform.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The maximum penalty would only be applied in an extreme case when a life is lost.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I know perfectly well that a judge would exercise discretion. The Bill provides a penalty of £100 or 12 months' imprisonment, but that is a maximum penalty. However, in the light of section 62 I thought that the penalty—at least for the sake

of uniformity—would be the same in the proposed new section. The only other amendment is to section 69, which deals with the power of members of the police force to board ships for the purpose of preserving peace and good order and preventing and detecting the commission of offences. The section confers that power only on members of the force in charge of a police station or those holding a rank not lower than sergeant. It has been pointed out that it is not always practicable for a sergeant or officer in charge to accompany constables on such duties as these. At Port Adelaide, for instance, there is only one sergeant, and the constables there do the work in pairs. It would not be practicable for a sergeant to be in attendance all the time. Disturbances could occur on two or three ships at the same time, and at present a constable is debarred from boarding a vessel unless accompanied by the officer in charge of the station or by a sergeant. This section is now being amended to confer this power on any member of the police force. Section 70 is amended to provide that a sergeant or officer in charge will have the power to stop vessels when he suspects that certain things are happening. I feel that these amendments are justified and I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—The explanation of this Bill by the Minister and a detailed explanation by the honourable Mr. Bevan have confirmed my view that the Council should accept these amendments to the Police Offences Act. We were charged, on the foundation of the colony, to protect and care for the aborigines, but perhaps we have not always done all we could for these people. Of course, it is very difficult to mix the two bloods, which are vastly different, and to assimilate the aborigines with the white people. It will take time, if it is ever done. Many people have devoted much time and thought to the improvement of the aborigines' lot, and have provided homes on stations and farms for them, and occupations at which they may work. I accept the view that there have not been many successes, but if this stigma in our Police Offences Act is removed it may improve the conditions that exist.

Regarding the happenings at Victor Harbour referred to by Mr. Bevan, it seems to me that no judge would have convicted if the case had been brought before the court.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—The man was only warned.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—It seems to me that that case would not have been supported by the court. We are seeking to improve the lot of the aborigine, and if the existing provision gives offence to the aborigine or to the people attempting to improve his conditions I see no objection to the amendment.

Regarding the other clause, if a man feigns disappearance I think the penalty should be £100 if he puts the police to the trouble of trying to discover him. No doubt, in these cases public sympathy is aroused and it is remarkable how the public seeks to help. It is good to see it. However, when a case results in disastrous happenings as in the sad case at Victor Harbour, £100 is far too small a penalty to impose. The police are entitled to this amendment. The culprit who seeks to escape should be penalized. There is no harm in a man disappearing if he wants to, but he should not be allowed to put other people to trouble looking for him and not be punished. On many occasions the police have been put to much trouble trying to find missing persons. This clause will strengthen the Act. I support the Bill.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—I have no doubt that, when the original Act was drawn, section 14 was inserted to protect the aborigine against the actions of some white people. The wording is rather puzzling and should be made clearer. Section 14 reads:—

> Any person who, not being an aboriginal native of Australia, or the child of an aboriginal native of Australia, without reasonable excuse . . .''

I do not think ''reasonable excuse'' has ever been defined in the courts. If lawyers cannot decide and give us a clear idea of the meaning of that phrase, how will the guardians of the law, the police, interpret it? After all, in the last analysis they are charged with the protection of the aborigines and section 14 was inserted for the special purpose of protecting aborigines. Therefore, we have to be careful about repealing this provision.

The Minister has said that this provision would be an experiment. I hope the experiment is successful. The association of white people with aborigines has been much to the detriment of the aborigines. A striking example of that is the recent case of Albert Namatjira, a man of distinguished talents and great ability, but still primitive. His association with some very bad white people has led him and many of his tribe into great trouble. The assimilation of the black into

the white community is difficult and cannot be done easily. It should not be attempted quickly; it is a slow process. After all, there are not many aborigines in South Australia. While I am all for helping them (and the Government has shown its extreme sympathy by providing much money to help them by building homes for them in suitable cases, which is all to the good), this problem involves the racial question, which is an ugly question to bring up in any community. I hope the Government is correct in its attitude.

Recently I received some letters, which seem to suggest a considerable conflict, written by people who ought to know a good deal about these things. They do not seem to be clear in their minds whether this is the right thing to do. However, the Minister has assured us it is an experiment. The other clause is desirable. We have had one example of what can happen and has happened in this State. This clause has been introduced to prevent similar happenings. I support the second reading.

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

FIREARMS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1097.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I support this important Bill, which consists of 41 clauses in five parts. It is a Bill to be dealt with rather in Committtee than by second reading speeches. An Act was passed in 1956 requiring persons under the age of 18 and aliens to be licensed before using or possessing a firearm. That Act was never proclaimed and therefore is not law. As I understand it, legislation falls by non-proclamation. Parliament is wasting its time if legislation is not proclaimed.

Since the passing of the 1956 Act certain recommendations have been made by the Commissioner of Police and it is found necessary to take strong action. The 1956 Act repealed the Use of Firearms Restriction Act (1917-1934), the Firearms Registration Act (1919-1934), and the Firearms Restriction (River Murray) Act (1929). Section 5 of the 1956 Act deals with prohibition of possession of a firearm by a person under the age of 15 years. Section 6 deals with the matter of persons under the age of 18 years and aliens holding licences.

This Bill gives wider and more effective control over the use of firearms, and re-enacts both the licensing provisions of the 1956 Act and, in an improved form, the registration provisions of the Firearms Registration Act (1919-1934). This Act will not operate until a date fixed by proclamation, the purpose of that being to give sufficient time for regulations to be made. Clause 3 repeals four Acts, the provisions of which are included with modifications in this Act. Part III re-enacts, with improvements, the registration provisions of the Firearms Registration Act (1919-1934), and requires every person who owns a firearm to register it within 14 days of becoming the owner. There is a severe penalty for neglect. Clause 20 refers to change of address.

Part IV refers to use of rifled firearms from vessels on the River Murray. This is a forward move to protect the public. From what has happened recently, not only in South Australia but in other parts of Australia, it is necessary for some restrictive precaution to be taken. The Bill should be well considered by honourable members because, for reasons into which it is not necessary for me to go now, it has become necessary to introduce these restrictions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation."

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—As Mr. Condon has pointed out, this Bill is not only an amending Bill but a consolidating Bill. It is difficult to decide just what is new matter and what is old. It would be fairer if honourable members had a little more time in which to consider this in detail from that point of view, because the printed Bill does not indicate what is old and what is new. Therefore, I ask the Minister to report progress in order to give honourable members an opportunity to study the various clauses to see what should be discussed in Committee and what is simply a re-print of old matter.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LIBRARIES (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1165.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—Libraries have played a big part in the cultural activities of the public since the State was established. In looking through the report of Dr. A. Grenfell Price who was commissioned by the Government in 1939 to inquire into the management of libraries maintained or assisted

by the State I noticed the following reference to the history of the Public Library:—

This institution evolved from the South Australian Library and Scientific Association which was founded in London in 1834. The *Tam O'Shanter* brought the first library to the colony in 1836 and this developed under the usual institutes system of the nineteenth century. Thus the library was operated by the Mechanics Institute (1834-48), the South Australian Subscription Library and Mechanics Institute (1848-56) and the South Australian Institute (1856-84). In 1859 the South Australian Institute initiated the regular circulation of boxes of books to suburban and country institutes.

That report gives a complete review of South Australian libraries. As pointed out by Dr. Price, with the advent of free education public libraries fell somewhat into disuse, although colleges, high schools and various clubs determined to establish their own libraries. The Bill provides that if the Treasurer is satisfied that if a council or approved body will establish a library in rented premises and that the council or approved body will, within a reasonable time, acquire the ownership of premises in which to house the library, the Treasurer may subsidize the rent of the premises up to the amount of the rent paid by the council or approved body.

Some denominational institutions have their own libraries and I should like to know whether they could also be subsidized, because in effect they are public libraries as they do not differentiate between those who may use them. These churches are faced with capital cost in establishing the premises and have to meet running costs, although most of the labour is provided voluntarily. Could such libraries come under the heading of "an approved body"? Whilst the Government is subsidizing certain things that are demanded because of our progress, the Government should also consider subsidization in other directions. For instance, could it subsidize on a pound for pound basis the cost of building denominational orphanages, because it is to our younger people that we look for our future citizens. Various denominations are constructing buildings from their own resources to undertake a function that should be provided by the Government. I suggest that such institutions be subsidized.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—In 1936 it was provided under the Public Library, Museum, and Art Gallery, and Institutes Act that all institutes having libraries attached should form themselves into an association. There were about 300 libraries associated with institutes and since then quite a number have been closed, some of their own volition and some by the Institutes Association because their membership had fallen. Devoted men and women had given years in looking after these libraries voluntarily. Owing to changed times many country schools have been closed and often the local library was also closed. To try to improve the situation, the Government has provided additional funds. The Act of 1955 provided:—

If satisfied that any municipal council or district council or other body recommended by the municipal or district council and approved by the Treasurer will, in premises under the care, control or management of the council, or approved body, maintain and manage a library and that the council or approved body has provided or will provide the furniture and fittings necessary for the library, the Treasurer, subject to this Act, may in any financial year pay to the council or approved body towards the cost of maintaining and managing the library an amount not exceeding the amount paid by the council or approved body during the financial year towards said cost.

Under those circumstances the Government provided a subsidy. The library had to be under the roof of the council or the approved body and be subject to control by the Public Libraries Board. The result was that many councils did not subscribe and therefore no library was established, and the legislation really became a dead letter. In order to stimulate the position and bring life into the dead bones of some of these libraries, the Government has introduced this Bill. The library must be recommended by a council and approved by the Treasurer before a subsidy may be granted. This is a big step forward. The Treasurer on the recommendation of the Libraries Board will provide money for premises and also for furniture. The establishment of a library is costly. The Government is doing its best to stimulate the movement by introducing this legislation. It is a move in the right direction and therefore has my support.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 21, at 2.15 p.m.