

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, September 18, 1969.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Barley Marketing Act Amendment,
Brands Act Amendment,
Highways Act Amendment,
Railways Standardization Agreement
(Cockburn to Broken Hill) Act
Amendment.

QUESTIONS

WHEAT

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question concerns the present wheat crisis. Following the recent assessment of the current crop, it appears that there will be a very large harvest in South Australia, in excess of the proposed quota, and it is expected that the storage of this above-quota wheat could entail high cost to primary producers. This, coupled with the fact that we have just had a very good season following a drought, means that the primary producers in this position, in addition to the higher costs they will have to meet, will have a very high income tax bill for the financial year just completed.

It is usual for products grown within the financial year to be assessed for income tax for that year. In view of the present situation, if this practice is continued primary producers will in fact be paying income tax on non-quota grain that is stored either at their own expense on their properties or in the State storage system. They will be liable to pay income tax although the money will not actually be received until the following harvest. Will the Minister take up this matter with the Commonwealth Government to assess all the factors involved and, if possible, to give some relief?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will certainly take up the matter with my colleague the Treasurer with a view to his taking it up with the Commonwealth Treasurer.

VERMIN FENCE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Starting in October, 1968, I have asked a series of questions regarding the Government's attitude to increasing the subsidy toward maintaining the buffer vermin-proof fence. At present landholders abutting the fence pay 37c a square mile, and the Government pays 20c. Because the rising cost of maintaining the fence and its age will cause this subsidy to be inadequate, the State Government has been asked to increase its subsidy to match that of the landholders. As a result of my series of questions I have been led to believe that Cabinet will consider this request. Can the Minister say whether Cabinet has done so?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: At various times there have been discussions in Cabinet on the subject but I will take up the matter with the Minister of Lands and obtain a report for the honourable member.

GOVERNMENT ECONOMIES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In his report tabled this week the Auditor-General said:

The problem facing Government is how to keep the growth of public expenditure under control . . . insufficient attention is being given to economy.

Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government will take note of the Auditor-General's criticism and, if possible, take an even closer look at Government spending?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think most honourable members realize that the Government is constantly considering this question. Early in the session a similar question was asked by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill. We have in our Public Service the necessary machinery and personnel to do this sort of work constantly. Honourable members will notice, too, that the Auditor-General says that much more work was done last financial year by private contractors. He commented that this had allowed some economies to be made in Government expenditure. I assure the honourable member that this is a complex question and that the Government is at all times doing its best to ensure maximum economy in Government spending.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I believe a Bill will be introduced to amend the Local Government Act. Can the Minister say when it will be introduced?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think the honourable member is referring to the changes that have been contemplated for a long time now as a result of the sittings of the Local Government Act Revision Committee, whose report I am expecting to receive before the end of October. Undoubtedly, a Bill will be introduced following the issuing and consideration of that report but at the moment I cannot say when this will happen.

However, if the honourable member has any matters that he would like considered when the next amendments to the Act are made (and I have no doubt that he has this in mind, seeing that he has asked the question), I will be only too pleased to hear representations from him and give those matters every possible consideration.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1928-1958. Read a first time.

OPTICIANS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to incorporate the present Board of Optical Registration and to give effect to a number of suggestions made by the board for the improvement and modernization of the Opticians Act. This Act at present contains a good deal of obsolete matter, which is removed by the present Bill. The Bill provides for the reciprocal recognition of optometrical qualifications. The obsolete provisions relating to spectacle sellers are removed. The provisions relating to unqualified persons practising optometry are amended to conform with present standards and requirements. The regulation-making power is extended to empower the Governor to prescribe the

examinations that must be successfully completed in order to entitle an applicant to be registered as an optician, and to prescribe a code of ethics to be observed and obeyed by all certified opticians.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the passage "and spectacle sellers" wherever it occurs in section 2 of the Act. This is necessary because a later amendment to the Act removes the provisions dealing with the licensing of spectacle sellers.

Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act. The definition of "certified optician" is struck out and a new definition is inserted in lieu thereof. Under the amended definition a "certified optician" is defined as a person who is the holder of a valid certificate under section 22 of the principal Act, whereby he is entitled to practise as an optometrist or optician. The titles "optometrist" and "optician" are commonly used to denote practitioners of optometry. The Act at present makes no use of the word "optometrist" and the board is anxious that some statutory recognition be given to the use of this title by a practitioner of optometry. The definition of "co-operating State" is amended to conform with a later amendment to the Act that enables the board to make reciprocal arrangements with any country or State within or outside the Commonwealth of Australia for the registration of qualified practitioners of optometry.

Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act. New subsection (3) incorporates the board and invests it with the ordinary powers of a statutory corporation. New subsection (4) provides that judicial notice shall be taken of the common seal of the board. Clause 5 repeals section 5 of the principal Act. This deals with the first board to be appointed under the Act. That board had a life of three years and consequently section 5 has performed its purpose and is now redundant. Clause 6 amends section 6 of the principal Act. Again, obsolete matter is removed from this section and its provisions are brought into conformity with the amendments investing the board with corporate status. New subsection (3) is inserted as a precautionary measure to preserve in office members of the board holding office immediately before the commencement of the amending Act for the remainder of the term for which they were appointed.

Clauses 7, 8 and 9 strike out obsolete matter in sections 7, 8 and 9 of the principal Act respectively, and bring the provisions of these

sections into conformity with the amendments investing the board with corporate status. Clause 10 repeals and re-enacts section 10 of the principal Act. This provision deals with filling casual vacancies in the membership of the board. This section also contains obsolete matter and it is re-enacted to have substantially the same effect but in a modified and modernized form. Clause 11 amends section 11 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (3) of that section. This section deals with the power of the Governor to make an appointment if a person or persons having power to nominate members to the board fails or fail to make the nomination. Subsection (3) contains obsolete matter and is not really necessary for the proper operation of the section.

Clause 12 amends section 16 of the principal Act. It removes references to "licensed spectacle seller" and "licences" occurring in the section because, under the provisions of the Bill, the provisions dealing with licences for spectacle sellers are to be repealed. Clause 13 makes a decimal currency amendment to section 16a of the principal Act. Clause 14 amends section 18 of the principal Act. This section empowers the board to make reciprocal arrangements with competent authorities in other states and countries for the recognition and registration of qualified practitioners of optometry.

Clause 15 amends section 20 of the principal Act by striking out paragraphs (a), (b), (e) and (f) of subsection (1) and the whole of subsection (2). Much of the matter comprised in these provisions is now obsolete and new paragraphs (a) and (b) are substituted for the provisions repealed in subsection (1). These provide that a person is entitled to be registered as an optician if he was, immediately before the commencement of the Opticians Act Amendment Act, 1969, registered under the Opticians Act, 1920-1963, as a certified optician or if he has successfully completed the prescribed course in optometry or otherwise satisfied the board of his competency, and has otherwise complied with the Act and produces satisfactory evidence of good character.

Clause 16 repeals section 21 of the principal Act. This provision deals with the licensing of spectacle sellers. It is thought that spectacles should be dispensed only by legally qualified medical practitioners or certified opticians and, consequently, this provision is struck out. There are, in fact, no licensed spectacle sellers in this State at the present

time. Clauses 17, 18, 19 and 20 make consequential amendments to sections 22, 23, 24 and 26 of the principal Act, respectively.

Clause 21 amends section 27 of the principal Act by striking out the present subsections (2) and (3) and inserting new provisions in lieu thereof. New subsection (2) provides that a person not being a legally qualified medical practitioner or a certified optician shall not practise optometry, test eyesight, or dispense prescriptions for the purpose of correcting or compensating for, or designed to correct or compensate for, any imperfection or defect in the vision, or visual faculty or function of any person. New subsection (3) provides that subsection (2) is not to be construed as preventing any person from engaging in the trade or craft of grinding lenses or making spectacles, and that it does not apply to or in relation to a student of optometry who has obtained a prescribed standard in the prescribed course of study in optometry in respect of anything done by the student under the strict supervision of a certified optician. New subsection (4) prevents the sale or supply of lenses or spectacles except by a legally qualified medical practitioner or a certified optician. This subsection does not, however, prevent the sale of lenses and spectacles to legally qualified medical practitioners or certified opticians by persons who do not themselves possess those qualifications.

Clauses 22, 23 and 24 make decimal currency amendments to the principal Act. Clause 25 amends the heading preceding section 32 of the principal Act by striking out the passage "and spectacle sellers". Clauses 26 and 27 make amendments to the principal Act consequential on the repeal of the provisions dealing with the licensing of spectacle sellers.

Clause 28 makes a decimal currency amendment to section 37 of the principal Act. Clause 29 repeals section 38 of the principal Act. In view of the amendments to section 27 of the Act preventing the sale of lenses and spectacles to members of the public by unqualified persons, this provision is now redundant. Clause 30 amends section 45 (5) of the principal Act by striking out the reference to "licensed spectacle sellers". Clause 31 makes a decimal currency amendment to section 46 of the principal Act.

Clause 32 repeals the third schedule to the principal Act. This schedule prescribed the form of a licence to sell spectacles under section 21 of the Act, a provision which is to be repealed by the Bill. Clause 33 amends the fourth schedule to the principal Act.

It strikes out references to licences to sell spectacles. It inserts a provision enabling the Governor to prescribe the courses in examinations in optometry that shall be recognized by the board for the purposes of the Act. It gives a wider power to the Governor to prescribe the form of advertising matter pertaining to optometry, and it enables the Governor to prescribe a code of ethics to be observed and obeyed by all certified opticians.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from September 17. Page 1545.)

Clause 9—"Issue of certificate where land is vested in acquiring authority by operation of law or compulsorily acquired."

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): This amendment was initiated by the Deputy Commonwealth Crown Solicitor arising out of an easement to the Commonwealth of Australia from Port Augusta to Woomera. The issue of the easement title has been held up because two duplicate certificates of title could not be got in. The reason for one of them was that the registered proprietor was overseas and his attorney did not know where the duplicate title was.

In the other case a property had been sold under a contract of sale and the purchasers had completed payment, taken delivery of the duplicate title, had not registered a transfer and now cannot be found. As the law now is, the Registrar-General cannot issue a title for land acquired unless the duplicate title(s) is or are produced.

Under section 23a of the (State) Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925-1966, those authorities having the power to acquire land compulsorily may publish a proclamation in the *Gazette* and thereupon the land, the subject of the acquisition, immediately becomes vested in the acquiring authority notwithstanding the fact that the duplicate title is outstanding in the previous owner's name. The proposed amendment is designed to enable the Registrar-General to proceed with the issue of a certificate of title in the name of the acquiring authority, notwithstanding the fact that the existing duplicate title is outstanding—such duplicate already is of no effect because of the proclamation under which by operation of

law and without the execution of any transfer the land in question became vested in the acquiring authority.

I might add that a situation similar to that applying in connection with section 23a of the (State) Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act (and that was the section the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill referred to yesterday) applies in connection with compulsory acquisitions of land under Commonwealth law where acquisitions of land are usually made by notice published in the *Gazette* and upon the publication of the notice in the *Gazette* the land vests in the acquiring authority without the necessity of a transfer or the production of the duplicate certificate of title.

I hope that the further explanation fully satisfies the honourable member who raised the queries on this point, and I trust that I can now count on his support.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 40) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 1542.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): In speaking to this Bill I must commend the Treasurer for the wisdom of retaining a high balance in the Loan Account and hence reserves which can be ready to meet any emergency. It must be appreciated that, although we are being told of unprecedented prosperity and buoyancy in the economy as a whole, this does not apply in South Australia outside the metropolitan area. In every sector of agriculture we are facing bad troubles for which there is no easy solution in sight.

World surpluses or marketing difficulties face everyone in agriculture. With the single exception of beef, the commercial channels are clogged with agricultural commodity surpluses and, with beef, political considerations are strictly limiting export.

Although as a State we are a predominantly manufacturing community today, agriculture is still our largest industry and by far the most important generator of oversea funds. The farming community is getting heartily sick of learning of prosperity and full employment, being told to increase efficiency of production, and then being loaded with tax after tax and cost rise after cost rise.

As far as I can see, the economy is headed for bad trouble, for we cannot have our principal oversea fund-earning industry in trouble without the whole community being involved eventually. In the period ahead, caution and care in expenditure must be encouraged and commended wherever it appears. Retaining this reserve does mean that despite the frittering of funds that has taken place there is now the money in hand to fulfil all obligations and sustain trust funds in the custody of the Treasurer, a state of affairs that has not ruled in recent years.

I turn now to individual lines upon which I feel some comment is warranted. I am deeply disappointed to see that only \$100,000 extra is allotted to school buildings. In my view, the most important capital expenditure being made by the State is in education. With shortages and rising costs, this extra \$100,000 means that the actual accommodation increase will be less than in past years and very much less than it was a few years ago. A good deal of the money is now being devoted in new school construction to subsidiary and ancillary equipment and accommodation.

I think it is desirable to have this, but the important things after all which must be first counted are the individual desks, chairs and classrooms: anything else that diverts money from these must be regarded as parasitic on education funds. When we have all the classrooms, teachers and desks required—the bare basic necessities—then the subsidiaries should be met.

I know that teaching is a very scientific business today, but I am sure that in the Education Department as in many other Government departments there has crept in a "keeping up with the Joneses" attitude. This attaches not only to the schools but to tertiary education. The sum of \$5,000,000 is the Loan expenditure allocated for universities and for adult education purposes this year. How much of this will be spent on centres to offer refuge to young men who do not seem to have any real interest in their own education or any real interest in the university community and the future to which it is dedicated?

I believe that we should be spending much more of our funds on education, but it should be a question of first things first until we have overcome the hideous backlog. The fact that we are turning away from universities hundreds of young men and women who are of the standard and ability to go on to higher

education means that we are wasting our most important asset—the brains and ability of young people.

We are, through crowded classes and insufficient teachers, preventing many children from reaching a stage where they are fitted for tertiary education, and thereby we are further seriously thwarting the potential of the State.

I should like to comment on the provision of \$300,000 for South-Eastern drainage. This item must be questioned; indeed, the whole subject of drainage in the South-East must urgently be given a new appraisal. I believe that a completely new approach should be made, writing off much of the work that has gone before. There are areas in the South-East where drains are now undoubtedly doing harm and where men are being charged betterment that cannot possibly be proved.

Men are being charged for maintenance of what can no longer be called an asset; rather, it is a monstrous liability. I understood that this whole subject was under urgent review, but this item does not indicate any such move. Apparently we are to go on in the same old way for another year, and there is no possible excuse for this.

These drains were once needed to open up the land. A few small corners may still need initial clearing of surplus water, but once this is achieved the purpose of the drains seems to be past. We do not need in perpetuity a system that wastes valuable water out to sea. We can almost certainly use every drop of it ashore if we can only get those responsible to stop and take a new look, instead of madly digging ahead.

I think every honourable member should be taken to Modbury, Tea Tree Gully, Belair and Blackwood and other clay soil localities where subdivision has been permitted and where there is septic tank disposal of sewage. It is scandalous that the conditions that rule as soon as the soil becomes wet are permitted in a modern community. Every street stinks with effluent that cannot soak into the soil. Correction of this position must be given priority. If full sewerage cannot be provided, surely a simple, cheap method of collecting tank effluent can be devised in order to remedy this scandalous situation. I can see no item of expenditure that is to be devoted to this work, but I sincerely hope that it is in the section dealing with sewerage in new areas.

The sum of \$244,000 has been devoted, under various headings, to the Agriculture Department. This item worries me. I know

the volume and quality of work coming from institutions in other States similar to our experimental farms and orchards, but I wonder whether we are getting our money's worth. In the past few years huge Government office buildings have been erected and fully occupied but we still have big buildings in Rundle Street and Gawler Place that are substandard. Rental is paid for office areas in other buildings all over the city.

For many years the offices of the Premier and Chief Secretary were situated in a few rooms in the Treasury building, and the staffs were contented and efficient. The Minister of Agriculture had his office in what is now the office of the Director of Agriculture. Is this lavish expenditure on prestige accommodation warranted, when we cannot find enough money for schools and when sewage is running down suburban streets?

I think there must immediately be a loud call to look into means of saving, because I am sure millions of dollars are being wasted in these ways. I call for a very much closer review of Government expenditure. The Treasurer claims that economies are being made and that there is a close watch on expenditure. As far as I can see, in a great many cases this is mere lip service.

The last item upon which I wish to comment is the allocation to the Cadell Training Centre. I am sorry that there is no provision for a similar mooted institution in the South-East. My remarks are intended to be not in criticism of the Cadell centre but in praise—but not in praise of the value of any of these institutions in respect of their work with Aborigines committed to their care.

It is quite certain that Northfield, Cadell, the McNally Training Centre and, indeed, the corrective and penal system as a whole are completely unsuited to the rehabilitation of the Aborigines who year by year constitute an increasing proportion of their inmates. If honourable members care to look at the figures they will be horrified, particularly when it is remembered that our total Aboriginal population is about 7,000. These people are in trouble enough.

The whole question of their correction and rehabilitation after they come into contact with the law must be completely revised. As we are handling the question at present, we are materially destroying any chance for young Aborigines, who have more than enough trouble in finding a place in the world. A young Aboriginal committed to one of these

institutions leaves with a prison record and a training by really expert mischief-makers. What could be a real opportunity to help these people is being lost: they are being hurried down the road to degradation. I stress that this is not a matter for years ahead: this is an urgent and very difficult matter.

To condemn an Aboriginal boy, girl or young adult to such institutions is completely and utterly wrong. It is urgent that this chain be broken at once. These are people in need of help, not criminals to condemn. They need special training, not punishment. Special institutions should be set up at once to meet their special needs. I support the Bill, but I am sure there is need for a much closer review of how the money is spent; of course, the larger items call for examination by the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): When I first became a member of this Council the Loan Estimates paper was a straightforward document. It almost invariably began with the allocation of funds to the various projects that the Government had in mind. This long-accepted and conventional method of financing was departed from when the Labor Party took charge of the Treasury benches. Then, there seemed to be a certain amount of juggling of finances, and quite a large amount of the Treasurer's statement on the Loan Estimates was taken up by a preamble justifying the departure from the conventional method of financing this State's Loan programme. At present practically two pages are taken up in explaining the reason for this departure in respect of methods of financing this State's Loan works.

In 1965, when the Labor Government came to power, one of the first things it did to help its Loan situation was to recall sums of money that had been made available to the Highways Department over a period of years so that matching money could be put up to attract grants from the Commonwealth Government. Then, in the following year (to June 30, 1966) there was a deficit on Revenue Account of \$5,612,000 and a deficit on Loan Account of \$2,465,000, making a combined deficit of \$8,077,000, which was temporarily met out of trust funds held by the Government.

This situation continued during the Labor Government's term of office. An explanation for this departure from the accepted methods of financing was given by the Hon. F. H. Walsh, who was then both Premier and Treasurer. He occupied about half a page

of the Loan Estimates giving various reasons why the Government should not adopt this form of financing, and then went on to say that the Government was forced into this situation. At that time certain expenses, such as building grants for education purposes and hospitals, which totalled \$4,500,000 and which were normally met from revenue, were transferred to the Loan Account. I am not going to say that this method of financing should be discontinued, because when one is half way across a tight rope one cannot turn back: one cannot eliminate the deficits that have been created beforehand.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have \$12,000,000 up your sleeve. What are you talking about?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I will get to that in due course. When we find ourselves getting in debt, it is necessary for us to effect some economies; this aspect was mentioned by the Auditor-General in his report, which was released this week. The present Government has been able, through effecting economies, to reduce the combined deficits although, admittedly, by only a small amount. For the year just ended the Revenue Account is in credit by about \$460,000 and, although that is not a great reduction in the combined deficit that was hanging over our heads, it indicates that the present Government has tried to effect certain economies and to balance the Budget.

I want to make the point that, through using Loan funds for revenue expenses over a period of years, we have deprived the State of some much needed capital works, the main one of which has been the building of more schools and teachers colleges. The Labor Party must also accept its fair share of blame for the shortage in the numbers of schools and teachers in this State. All members know of the campaign which is being waged at the moment and which is directed (as it would appear from the statements that one hears) against the present Government.

This shortage of school buildings and of teachers has been a gradual process and is not only the fault of the present Government. Indeed, the Labor Party, when it was in charge of the Treasury benches, did not allocate a greater percentage of the money available to education than the present Government is doing; in fact, the latter is making a valiant effort to meet the situation, a situation in which it has hanging over its head an accumulated deficit that was created by the previous Administration.

If one cared to do some arithmetic one would find that the percentage of the State Budget that has been allocated to education over recent years has been steadily rising while the allocation to other important departments has been decreasing. If we increase the allocation to the Education Department or to any other department, it must be at the expense of other departments, unless we are prepared to increase the level of taxation in this State. I know it will be said that the Commonwealth should come to light with more funds for the States. We are prepared to accept this but, after all, where does the money come from? It all comes from the same source, and if additional moneys are to come from the Commonwealth Government we must expect to pay additional taxation.

The Auditor-General also said that inevitably we must reach the situation where increased charges will have to be levied upon the public if there is a continued demand for increased services. In explaining the departure from the normal method of accounting, the Hon. Frank Walsh outlined the disadvantages that the State would suffer as a result of this form of financing. When the Hon. Mr. Dunstan came into office he made no excuses for adopting this form of allocation from Loan funds. Indeed, he said that it was the long-standing practice in the other States to meet such expenses from Loan funds.

We have reached the stage today where we have an accumulated deficit and where our public debt is increasing. It is easy for any individual to expand his operations by going into debt and, by using Loan funds which must be repaid, we as a State go further into debt. I accept that the present generation should not be held entirely responsible for the provision of facilities that this State requires: posterity should also pay its share. However, we must not foist upon posterity a debt that will stifle the progress of this State; we must learn to live within our means.

I should like to comment briefly on a number of items in the Loan Estimates. The amounts that have been allocated to loans to producers, advances to settlers and to the State Bank are in keeping with the allocations over the years. However, I wonder whether the sum that has been provided for these items will be sufficient, bearing in mind the present economic situation of the rural industry. Undoubtedly, many primary producers are entering a period in which they will need more financial support from the Government

and from various departments, and I wonder whether the sums made available will be sufficient; I certainly hope they will.

I am pleased to see that further money has been made available to complete the Cadell pumping station. This project, which has been on the drawing board for a long time, is badly needed because of the high salinity that is accumulating on the blocks in that area, and I am pleased to see that it is nearing completion.

Turning to harbours accommodation, we see that funds are made available for berthing facilities for interstate container and roll-on-roll-off traffic. It is felt by many people today that we are entering an era of containerization with shipping. This may be so, but I think we must also recognize that South Australia's total tonnage of shipping is such that we have no hope in this State of ever becoming a terminal container port. All we can do is to provide for the smaller container ships to trade in this State and take some of our produce to the container terminals. There is definitely a need to deepen some of our harbours. This, too, is a costly process. In South Australia we have a number of outports and we are committed to maintaining them for a number of years. If we are to do this we must make provision for larger ships to trade with these outports. As regards metropolitan sewerage the Treasurer states:

The sum of \$625,000 is provided for the virtual completion of the Bolivar sewage treatment works. This major scheme is estimated to cost \$24,375,000 and expenditure to the end of June last was \$23,700,000. All contract works on the civil structures and machinery installations are nearing completion. It is anticipated that the treatment works will be in full operation by 1970, including the generation of electric power utilizing sewage gas from the sludge digestion tanks.

Looking back at the Loan Estimates for 1967-68, we find that the completion date was set down as September, 1968, but now we find it is to be 1970. I am wondering whether anything has gone amiss at the Bolivar treatment works, whether the contracts are up-to-date, because there is still an unpleasant odour emanating from these works. We were told that, with the completion of the third stage, this would disappear but unfortunately it is still with us. One wonders whether it will be possible to eliminate completely the unpleasant odour coming from these works. I note, too, that a large volume of water still comes daily through the works and that no use so far has been made

of it. I trust the day is not far distant when an economic use can be found for the large volume of effluent coming from these works.

Coming to country sewerage, I notice that provision is made for the extension of sewerage facilities to Gawler. This is a large and necessary project in that district. I had reason to visit a property in the township of Gawler recently. If one could see how the effluent from the septic tanks is being disposed of, one would realize the urgent necessity for speeding up the work of providing sewerage facilities in Gawler. School buildings have been dealt with by most honourable members who have spoken so I shall not go into that at length, but there is one item on which I wish to comment—the purchase of land, buildings and residences for school purposes. My point is that there appears to be an unusually long delay in getting a transfer of title, when land is to be acquired for school purposes. Recently, I had to pursue a matter in connection with a school not very far from Adelaide where it was intended to build a new school on the site of the present school but, on further reflection, the Education Department, after being approached by the local school committee, decided it would be preferable to build the new school on a new site adjacent to the present site; but the school committee was told that if this was done there would be a delay of between 20 and 24 months before the necessary land could be acquired.

I know that under our Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act if land was compulsorily acquired the Education Department could occupy it much sooner. This seems to be an unusually long time to get a transfer. I accept that it is correct but one wonders whether this type of transfer of land could be speeded up by the Lands Department. Once money is made available on the Loan Estimates for the building of schools (and in the Loan Estimates \$191,000 is made available for the building of this school at Virginia), one always fears that if any delay occurs the money may not appear on the Loan Estimates the following year. I trust that the money made available for the school at Virginia on these Loan Estimates will not disappear altogether if the school is not proceeded with forthwith. The Government should examine this matter of long delays in the transfer of land. I realize that great care must be taken when moneys from the public purse are involved.

One is always pleased when new police stations are to be built in country towns, because the police station is one of the main and most important buildings in a country town. I notice that police stations are to be built at Blanchetown, Maitland, Para Hills, Port Wakefield and Snowtown, in addition to some others—but those particular towns are all in Midland District. The policeman is, of course, a man with some status in a town, and the conditions under which he works should be such as to build up rather than detract from that status. As regards school buildings, police stations and railway stations, I note with some interest a remark by the Auditor-General to the effect that he recognizes that more private contract work should be arranged by certain Government departments. The maintenance of school buildings, and possibly police stations and railway stations, could be more economically done by tradesmen who live in the particular town rather than by the Public Buildings Department.

For instance, the painting of schools, a fairly large job for which the Public Buildings Department employs a large work force, could be done by private contract, and in many cases by painters residing in the area. There have been cases where this has been done, and the department recognizes that this policy could be pursued. Considerable economies have been effected where local talent has been employed. In fact, not only has a considerable economy been effected but also a better job has been done by the local tradesman. So I commend to the Government the employment of local tradesmen. We talk about the need for the decentralization of industry. This is one field in which people in country areas could be usefully and economically employed in their own towns.

I am also pleased to see that money is being made available at Roseworthy College for the commencement of work on the remodelling of the wine cellars in order to improve the administration and facilities in connection with the oenology course at the college. The wine industry is most important to this State, and I believe that Roseworthy College provides a course that is unequalled in the Commonwealth for oenology students. One is pleased to see that the Government recognizes the need to make provision for the expansion of facilities there.

On the question of public health, I am interested to see that provision has been made for the establishment of dental clinics at

various country schools. The only thing that concerns me is whether sufficient personnel will be available to staff these clinics once they have been established. Here again, it is a commendable project and I trust that sufficient personnel will be available so that full use can be made of the dental clinics.

Money has been made available for the building of non-governmental hospitals, not only in the metropolitan area but also in a number of country areas. It is always debatable whether one should build up hospital facilities in some country towns and areas or whether one should pursue a policy of establishing base hospitals in large centres to be fed by ambulance services and by other means. However, the South Australian hospital system is rather unique; it is a system serving a most useful purpose. The provision of community hospitals in country areas is, I believe, another form of decentralization, and I think this practice is just as economical as having large base hospitals. In fact, the provision of a hospital in a country town often leads to the establishment of a chemist's shop; without a hospital there would not be a chemist's shop. I have suggested that in certain areas it would be better if they did not have their own small community hospital but had an ambulance service. However, country people are extremely proud of their hospitals and contribute to them freely. In fact, in many areas such hospitals are a drain on the local community but rather than lose the hospital the people there are prepared to accept their responsibility.

I note that money has been made available for the rebuilding of the Maitland Hospital, which is a fairly large hospital serving a fairly wide area. Although the present building is not very old, it is, unfortunately, built on foundations not suitable to the soil conditions, and the building itself is in a bad state of repair.

A sum of money has been made available to the Mines Department, but it does not appear to be a very large sum although no doubt it will be sufficient to enable the department to carry on for a further 12 months. I think it must be recognized that minerals play a large part in the economy of this State at the present time; not only in this State, but in the economy of the whole of the Commonwealth. One could say that Australia is, perhaps, living on its mineral wealth, and this is the result of the efforts of the present Government and past Governments (particularly the Playford Administration in its desire

to develop the huge mineral wealth that this State obviously possesses). It is through the efforts of our Mines Department in surveying the possible mineral deposits that exist in this State that we are able to exploit this very worthwhile industry. I trust that the amount of money made available this year will be sufficient for the Mines Department not only to carry out its present work but also for it to expand its activities in this direction.

There are a number of items one could continue to speak on, but I think the most important of them have been covered by other honourable members. Furthermore, we will have an opportunity to debate matters in relation to State finances when the Budget comes before this Council, and with those remarks I support the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I thank honourable members for the attention they have given to the Bill before them. I do not think there is a great deal I need reply to, although today both the Hon. Mr. Kemp and the Hon. Mr. Hart raised certain matters that I will not be able to answer without further consultation. However, if either member requires further information I will be pleased to supply it.

The matters I wish to reply to are mainly those raised by the Leader and by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone. Perhaps I can quote two of their statements in reply to the main theme of their song. Firstly, the Hon. Mr. Kneebone mentioned that the Government had "salted away" a total of \$12,000,000, and he further said that this money should have been used for such things as school buildings and hospitals and he asked why more funds for those projects had not been provided. I believe the Leader also referred to matters of a like nature.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The Premier made a certain statement at Naracoorte.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I did not know the Hon. Mr. Kneebone took a small quotation from a newspaper report of what was said at Naracoorte, and I would like to deal with this matter in my reply in this debate. I want honourable members to be quite clear on the statement that the Government has "salted away" this amount of money. Of course, on examination this will be found not to be the case, and I point out to the Council that almost \$8,000,000 of the \$12,000,000 mentioned had already been spent. The fact is that on assuming office the present Government faced a deficit in the funds of the State, and \$8,000,000 of the \$12,000,000 referred to is needed to take

care of that deficit. Perhaps we should look further—at the situation as it existed from June, 1964—so that members of this Council may properly understand the exact financial situation.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: If this is so, how is the statement of the Premier at Naracoorte correct when he said that, if this recent High Court ruling affects us, the \$12,000,000 can be used for this purpose if there is not \$12,000,000 there?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is not \$12,000,000 there.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Was the Premier "pitching a story" again?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I point out that the Premier was being quoted by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone on a statement the Premier made at Naracoorte; it is a press statement I have not read, but the Premier is perfectly aware of the figures I am now going to present. In June, 1964, the surplus in Government accounts amounted to \$3,844,000; in June, 1965, after the Government had incurred a deficit in its Revenue Account for that financial year, the surplus available was \$1,223,000. During 1965-66 the deficit for that financial year amounted to \$6,834,000. So taking into account the fact that there was a surplus of \$1,223,000 at the beginning of 1965-66, we see that the Revenue deficit in that financial year amounted to \$5,611,000. That was the actual cash position as at June 30, 1966.

During the 1966-67 financial year there was an actual cash surplus of about \$106,000, but this cash surplus was achieved only after debiting to the Loan Account the sum of \$6,902,000 that had previously, in all other years, been carried by the Revenue Account. During the 1967-68 financial year there was an overall cash deficit of \$2,860,000, and in that year a total sum of \$5,015,000 was charged to the Loan Account that had previously been carried by the Revenue Account. It can be seen that without the change in the financial procedures of the State, the change being made in the 1966-67 financial year, the total deficits between 1965 and 1968 on Revenue Account amounted to \$21,505,000. With the money in hand on June 30, 1965 (\$1,223,000), the actual net deficit for that period on Revenue Account was \$20,200,000. This was financed by \$11,917,000 of this amount being carried by the Loan Account; the balance, of course, was the actual deficit that this Government inherited.

I am not making this a political argument: these are the facts of the case. In this \$12,000,000 we are discussing there is a sum to cater for the \$8,000,000 or thereabouts deficit that this Government inherited. That means that in actual fact we are budgeting in our Loan Account this year for a surplus of about \$4,000,000. We have to be extremely careful in husbanding our Loan expenditure, for we have to ensure that we can meet any emergency that may arise. In fact, as the Minister of Roads and Transport knows, we have this year received a report regarding a railway line on which there have been several derailments. Because we have been financing the State in a proper manner, we are able to meet these emergency situations when they arise, and Loan funds at the last moment could be found to assist in the rehabilitation of a line which, on the report, needs a good deal of money spent on it.

This comes down to the very question of financial management. If I followed the arguments of the Leader and the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, they say we should not be financing the State in this particular way, that we should become more reckless, and that we should be dipping into our finances at this point of time and risking deficits. I can say quite clearly, Mr. President, that the documents the Treasurer submits with his reports clearly show how the State is going about financing its activities, and we do not intend to follow the procedures of running risks with the State's finances. The policy of the Government is quite clear on this, and that is to maintain a steady programme of work in the State and not run any risks without having the ability to meet difficult situations that may arise. No-one can tell when another drought may be around the corner or when money may be needed to provide for some other catastrophe that may occur, and the State intends to be in a position to meet such demands as they arise.

I repeat that the whole financial philosophy of the present Government is to maintain a steady programme of work in the State and to maintain a stability in the economy with a gradual upward trend. I think if honourable members look back over the period of time this Government has been in office they will see that this has been achieved, even though we began our term of office with a very serious financial situation.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp referred to the sum of money being made available for teaching facilities. I have some figures here which, although

I have not had time to check them carefully, I believe are correct. If my memory serves me correctly, I think the honourable member said that he was disappointed with the increase of only \$100,000 in the allocation for school buildings. I think this may also have been referred to by other honourable members.

The simple fact is that in the last two years of the Playford Administration the average expenditure on school buildings was more than \$10,000,000. For those two years and for the first year of this present Government's term of office the average expenditure has been \$10,900,000, whereas for the three years between 1965 and 1968 the average expenditure was \$10,400,000. I point out that this year's allocation (once again I am subject to correction because I am speaking from memory) is between 25 per cent and 30 per cent up on the expenditure of the last financial year of the Labor Government. For 1965-66, Loan expenditure on school buildings was \$11,750,000; for 1966-67 it was \$10,750,000; and for 1967-68 it was \$8,628,000. In the first year of the present Government the expenditure was \$11,670,000.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This includes the amount underspent from the last year of the Labor Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They don't tell you anything about that, or about the sabotage that took place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Leader talks about sabotage.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We were told it would all be spent, but when the figures came out there was an underspending of \$3,000,000-odd. Ask yourself who sabotaged it. I can tell you if you want me to.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I can tell the Leader something about that. The actual underspending in 1967-68 was \$5,600,000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes, \$3,000,000-odd in education and \$2,000,000-odd in hospitals.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We took office in April, 1968, and what we are being charged with is that in the two months before the end of the financial year we so closed down the expenditure in this State that this sum of money was not spent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I didn't say the Government did it. I was talking about the sabotage that took place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not follow what the Leader means by that. We are dealing here with money actually expended

over these three financial years. In the three financial years between 1965 and 1968 the average expenditure was \$10,400,000, and in two years of the Playford Administration and the one year of this Government the average expenditure was \$10,900,000. These figures show the change in the expenditure on these lines.

Regarding the question of Commonwealth involvement, in the triennium in which the Labor Government was involved it matched Commonwealth expenditure to the tune of \$13,633,000, and in the triennium from 1967 to 1970 the present Government has agreed to match expenditure of \$19,867,000, yet we are told that this Government is not paying sufficient attention to education! I have not had time to study this matter: I am raising it only because the Hon. Mr. Kemp referred to it this afternoon. I thought that these figures should at least be made available to the Council. Other questions have been raised today and, if honourable members want replies to them, I will only be too pleased to supply them.

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

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 1481.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): The main points that honourable members have made during the debate on this Bill have been incorporated in the amendments they have foreshadowed. If I replied to the points now I would have to repeat my replies when the Bill reached the Committee stage. Consequently, I will further discuss the points raised at that stage. I thank honourable members for the attention they have given to the Bill and for the extremely worthwhile comments they have made during the fairly long period of the debate on this measure.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole Council on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause dealing with the method of voting.

The PRESIDENT: I have examined the notice of motion and the Bill and find that the method of voting is not dealt with in the Bill as presented to the Council. Considerable difficulty has been experienced in the past in determining how far the Council should go in permitting the widening of the scope of Bills.

In 1957 the President ruled a notice of motion for an instruction out of order on the grounds of irrelevance (Council minutes, 1957, page 74). The Bill was returned from the Assembly with amendments, one of which was identical to the one for which the instruction had been sought. The Council resolved to consider the amendment and agreed to the same (minutes, 1957, page 116). Subsequently, the Standing Orders Committee reviewed the Standing Orders relating to instructions, and reported as follows:

The Standing Orders Committee has met and considered the Standing Orders dealing with instructions to committees of the whole Council on Bills. The Committee recommends no amendment of the Standing Orders but suggests that, in cases where motions for instructions comply with the Standing Orders in all respects other than relevancy, the President direct the attention of the Council to the position and leave it to the Council to decide whether the instruction should be given to the Committee (minutes, 1958, page 125.)

In accordance with that suggestion, I draw the Council's attention to the following: first, the method of voting is not dealt with in the Bill as presented to the Council, and the subject matter of the proposed instruction is not relevant to the subject matter of the Bill as disclosed by its clauses but is relevant to the title, as required by Standing Order No. 423; secondly, an amendment was moved in another place dealing with the method of voting. That amendment was lost and the clause to which it was moved was struck out of the Bill. Thirdly, according to my reading of *May's Parliamentary Practice* (page 541) the matter should be the subject of a separate Bill; and, finally, it is for the Council to decide whether or not the instruction should be agreed to.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Application for a postal vote certificate and a postal ballot-paper."

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I move:

In paragraph (b) after "is" to strike out "by reason of illiteracy" and insert "for any reason".

On an examination of the Bill and the Act, I find that this provision in the Bill is something new that has been introduced regarding an application for a postal vote. No provision is made in the Act now for people who cannot for any reason write and, therefore, who cannot apply for a postal vote. This amendment to the Act has been restricted to persons

who cannot apply by reason of illiteracy, and if provision is going to be made for people who cannot sign their name and therefore cannot apply for a postal vote, it should also apply to other people in similar circumstances.

There are many instances where people with poor sight or recovering from an accident in hospital cannot sign their name and, therefore, cannot apply for a postal vote. If this provision set out in the Bill is to be inserted in the Act, I should like to see it extended to cover all categories of handicapped persons, rather than singling out people who are illiterate.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I oppose the amendment. This Bill was accepted in another place by the Minister in charge of the Electoral Act, which was amended to prevent any skulduggery, such as had occurred previously, taking place. If the Bill refers to one category of people, that should be the end of it. However, if it is left wide open and applies to anyone (and such a person applying for a postal vote could even be drunk), where do we get to? From my knowledge of postal voting procedures, I should hate to think what could happen. The clause is all right as it stands. If necessary, progress could be reported so that honourable members could examine the matter.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I point out that the amendment refers to the application for a postal vote and not to the actual postal vote.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I could tell you of some crook ones in that regard, too.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The whole purpose of the Act and of holding elections is to enable us to obtain an expression of opinion from the public, and I cannot see why this amendment to the postal voting procedure should be introduced. Indeed, I would be happy if it were deleted altogether. However, if one factor is to be introduced, surely we must consider other people who are handicapped for one reason or another, perhaps only temporarily. I have discussed this matter with the Parliamentary Draftsman, and he has suggested that the inclusion of the words "for any reason" will cover the situation.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: This is an interesting matter. I am inclined to wonder, with the honourable member who moved the amendment, why we need have this provision at all. I know it is undesirable that any

person, whether or not he be illiterate or whether or not he be unable temporarily to sign his name, should be deprived of applying for a postal vote. One of the factors about an application for a postal vote and about the signature of a person applying for a postal vote is that that signature can be used as a test against the ultimate signature that comes in on the vote or on the certificate accompanying it. The normal procedure in law is for an illiterate person to sign his name by making a mark, usually a cross, in the presence of a witness.

That does not help very much when we compare it because, if a person has to make a mark on an application for a postal vote, he has to make a mark on his certificate. Comparing one mark with another is not very much help to the returning officer who is trying to satisfy himself that it is the same person recording the vote. I am wondering how we can get over this difficulty. If a person is unable, because he has had an accident or broken his arm, to sign the application for a postal vote, he may be able to sign when he votes later.

I am concerned about the extension of the clause as proposed in the amendment, and also about why we have to allow an illiterate person to make an application. Some people perhaps should not be required to make a vote. For instance, I question whether we should force elderly people to apply for votes.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): In its unamended form the principal Act makes no provision for a person who cannot sign his name in his own handwriting to apply for a postal vote. The amendment by the Bill will allow such a person to have his application authenticated otherwise than by signing if by reason of illiteracy he is unable to sign his name. Illiteracy, strictly speaking, means being unable to read and hence unable to write.

The amendment would widen the classes of person who could have the application authenticated by including a person who for any reason was unable to write. The limitation to persons unable to sign by reason of illiteracy was agreed to by the Government in the House of Assembly, and the principal argument in favour of the limitation was that it would narrow the field in which irregularities might occur, since a false application for a postal vote would logically lead to the issue of a postal vote certificate that should not be issued.

While in the circumstances of this State postal voting is an essential element of the right to exercise a vote, it is clear that in its operation the system is susceptible to irregularity. It is significant that the major portion of the time of the last Court of Disputed Returns was taken up in dealing with irregularities or alleged irregularities in the postal voting procedure.

It is pointed out that the limitations proposed here do not deprive a person of the class referred to by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan of his right to vote, since his right to be assisted to vote is covered by sections 109 and 110 of the principal Act; but, of course, he must go to the booth and vote in those circumstances. The limitations apply only to his right to vote by post, as has already been mentioned. It is in this area of postal voting that irregularities are prone to occur.

Accordingly, I cannot see my way clear to support the amendment, which I oppose.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Could the Minister tell us the position of a person who is in a hospital and cannot use his hands to write because of dressings or plasters and who cannot appear at the polling booth on polling day? He is not illiterate and therefore is not covered in that way; he is not able to appear at the polling booth and therefore is not covered the other way.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: If a person is illiterate and makes an application for a postal vote under the provisions of this section, how does he vote when he gets his postal vote? Does he vote in the same way or not? If he cannot sign his application for the postal vote—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He signs by a cross.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I do not know what he does. How does he vote? If he is not requiring a postal vote, he goes to the booth and is assisted by the returning officer, and there is no problem; but now, where we allow him a postal vote, I want to know how he votes and whether there is any provision for a person to vote for him or to assist him. It seems ridiculous if we are to allow a man a postal vote on the grounds of illiteracy when we have not control of the circumstances existing at the casting of that vote.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As regards the point made by the Hon. Mr. Potter, the two authentications (the one on the application for the

postal vote and the one on the paper itself) are compared. It should be possible to marry them in.

I agree with the Hon. Mr. Springett that there is a problem in the circumstances he has raised, because it appears that under the existing Act and under the Bill the person who would be unable to write through having his hands damaged, either in the circumstances of a postal vote or in the circumstances of being taken to the poll, could not get a vote. In some cases he might be taken to the poll and there assisted so that his vote could be recorded.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I agree that we should not widen the field where irregularities may occur in voting, but why was this point introduced? The Act now has no provision for a person who cannot sign his name; this is a new factor that has been introduced. It would widen the opportunity for misconduct to take place. My amendment is to ensure that all sections of people who cannot apply in the normal manner will have an equal opportunity to vote. I should be happy if the paragraphs referred to in the first two amendments I have on the file were deleted, because they would not make any difference to the administration of the Act.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, and I give notice that I will move that these paragraphs be deleted after his amendments have been dealt with. I believe the main purpose of requiring an application for a postal vote is to enable a comparison to be made with the signature appearing on the voting certificate. I cannot see how it is possible to compare a cross with a cross, even though I suppose it could be said that if a cross appears on an application and another cross appears on the voting paper then there must be some suggestion that it probably came from the same person.

I am concerned with another aspect: an illiterate person may execute a document by making a mark in the form of a cross, but I doubt whether those unfortunate people who are unable to write would be able to find a witness who understood his responsibilities sufficiently to act as a witness to a mark on a postal certificate that would be acceptable to a returning officer. No doubt any honourable member in this Chamber would know what to do in those circumstances, but the average person (and I remind honourable members that an 18-year-old may now be a witness) would not understand this. If a man made

his mark on a postal certificate and it was incorrectly witnessed, then that vote would have to be disregarded. I cannot see why we should try to allow a postal vote to an illiterate person in the first place.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Anybody who has helped people in a rest home to vote realizes that they need not necessarily be aged persons: many are ill and unable to write if suffering from rheumatoid arthritis or similar complaints. Such people are being deprived of a vote. Many illiterate people are able to sign their names and to copy numbers. Therefore, I support the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan's amendment and the amendment suggested by the

Hon. Mr. Potter: We should not give to illiterate people an opportunity to vote that others with more justification to vote have not got.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The points raised in the last few moments should be fully considered. As I should like to have further time to consider these points and the amendments of which the Hon. Mr. Potter has given notice, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.18 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 23, at 2.15 p.m.