

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

No. 73

WEDNESDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 1982

- 1 The House met, at 1.45 p.m., pursuant to adjournment. Mr Speaker (the Right Honourable Sir Billy Snedden) took the Chair, and read Prayers.
- 2 **MINISTERIAL ARRANGEMENTS:** Mr Fraser (Prime Minister) informed the House that, during the absence abroad of Mr McVeigh (Minister for Housing and Construction), Mr Thomson (Minister for Science and Technology) was acting as Minister for Housing and Construction.
- 3 **QUESTIONS:** Questions without notice were asked.
- 4 **PAPERS:** The following papers were presented:
 - By command of His Excellency the Governor-General:
 - Aboriginal Development Commission—Interim Report, for year 1980-81.
 - Aboriginal Hostels Ltd—7th Annual Report and financial statements, together with the Auditor-General's Report, for year 1980-81.
 - Canberra Commercial Development Authority—4th Annual Report, for year 1978-79.
 - Canberra Retail Markets Trust—Report, for year 1980-81.
 - National Committee on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation—8th Annual Report, for year 1980-81.
 - Pursuant to statute:
 - Atomic Energy Act—Australian Atomic Energy Commission—29th Annual Report and financial statements, together with the Auditor-General's Report, for year 1980-81.
 - Egg Export Control Act—Australian Egg Board—34th Annual Report, for year 1980-81.
- 5 **DEPORTATION ORDERS AGAINST MR LUIGI POCHI AND MR VINCENZO BARBARO—ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS TRIBUNAL RECOMMENDATIONS—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—PUBLICATION OF PAPER—PAPER NOTED:** Mr Macphee (Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs), by command of His Excellency the Governor-General, presented the following paper:
 - Deportation orders against Mr Luigi Pochi and Mr Vincenzo Barbaro—Administrative Appeals Tribunal recommendations—Ministerial statement, 24 February 1982,
 - and, by leave, made a ministerial statement informing the House of his decision not to accept recommendations of the Administrative Appeals Tribunal to revoke deportation orders against Mr Luigi Pochi and Mr Vincenzo Barbaro.
 Mr Sinclair (Leader of the House), by leave, moved—That this House, in accordance with the provisions of the *Parliamentary Papers Act 1908*, authorises the publication of the paper.
 Debate ensued.
 Question—put and passed.
 Mr Sinclair moved—That the House take note of the paper.

Mr Young moved, as an amendment—That all words after “That” be omitted with a view to substituting the following words: “this House is of the opinion that the deportation orders against Mr Pochi and Mr Barbaro should be suspended pending:

- (1) in the case of Mr Pochi, the production by the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs of further and more substantial reasons explaining how the findings of the Woodward Royal Commission differed, if at all, from the evidence supplied both in open court and *in camera* to Mr Justice Brennan at the Administrative Appeals Tribunal hearing;
- (2) in the case of Mr Barbaro, the production by the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs of further and more substantial reasons explaining how the information available to him about the nature and extent of Mr Barbaro’s involvement in commercial marihuana growing differed from material available to Mr Justice Fisher at the Administrative Appeals Tribunal hearing, and
- (3) in both cases, the findings of the pending Coronial Inquiry in New South Wales into the death of Donald Mackay”.

Debate continued.

Amendment negatived.

Question—That the House take note of the paper—put and passed.

- 6 **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE—REPORT:** Mr Bungey (Chairman) presented the following report from the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Report relating to the proposal for construction of additional training and sleeping accommodation at R.A.A.F. Base, Laverton, Vic. (1st report of 1982).

Ordered to be printed.

- 7 **DISCUSSION OF MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—HEALTH SCHEME:** Mr Deputy Speaker informed the House that both Dr Blewett and Mr Sainsbury had proposed that definite matters of public importance be submitted to the House for discussion today. In accordance with the provisions of standing order 107, Mr Speaker had given priority to the matter proposed by Dr Blewett, namely, “The mounting costs, the growing confusion, and the increasing inequity of the present health scheme”.

The proposed discussion having received the necessary support—

Dr Blewett addressed the House.

Discussion ensued.

Discussion concluded.

- 8 **PETITIONS:** The Clerk announced that the following Members had each lodged petitions for presentation, viz.:

Mrs Child, Mr Hurford, Mr Johnson, Mr Millar, Mr Shack and Mr Wallis—from certain citizens praying that the proposed sales tax on books, magazines and newspapers be withdrawn from the Budget proposals.

Mr Birney, Mr Innes and Mr Kerin—from certain citizens praying that funding of children’s services be restored to at least 1975–76 levels, budget allocations for children’s services be spent in full for the purposes designated and a means test not be imposed on the users of child care services.

Dr Everingham, Mr Moore and Mr Peacock—from certain citizens praying that the Senate’s requested amendments to the Sales Tax Bills be supported.

Mrs Child and Mr Connolly—from certain citizens praying that the Sex Discrimination Bill 1981 be passed.

Mr Drummond and Mr Lloyd—from certain citizens praying that their concern for Marie-France Claude and their wish that she be released from prison be passed on to the Haitian Government.

Mr Braithwaite—from certain residents of north Queensland praying that sufficient expenditure be allocated to raise the standard of the national highway in north Queensland to Department of Transport standards.

Mr R. J. Brown—from certain citizens praying that the Commonwealth funding of health services be continued at an improved level and the recommendations of the Committee of Review of Commonwealth Functions not be proceeded with.

- Mrs Child—from certain citizens praying that insulin syringes for diabetics be made available on the National Health Scheme and insulin prescriptions revert to 10 bottles.
- Mrs Child—from certain citizens praying that funding in the area of child care not be reduced and certain other action be taken to ensure that funds are allocated for part-time occasional care centres.
- Mrs Child—from certain citizens praying that sanitary products for women be brought under the scrutiny of the Australian Drug Evaluation Committee and certain other actions be taken in regard to the possible threat posed to the health of women by toxic shock syndrome.
- Mr Connolly—from certain citizens praying that all provisions of the Heritage Act and the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act be fully complied with in respect of national estate areas.
- Mr Connolly—from certain citizens praying that the Commonwealth's constitutional and legislative powers be used to grant full land rights and self-management to the Aboriginal people of Queensland.
- Mr Connolly—from certain citizens praying that theatre in Australia be supported by the increase of grants to a realistic level.
- Mr Fry—from certain citizens praying that funds be appropriated in the 1982-83 Budget for adequate ventilation of St Francis Xavier High School, Florey, A.C.T.
- Mr Howard—from certain citizens praying that a more restrictive immigration policy be maintained.
- Mr Hurford—from certain citizens praying that no plant variety rights legislation be enacted and a public inquiry be called into the impact of existing overseas schemes.
- Mr Jarman—from certain citizens praying that ex-servicewomen who volunteered for service in the 1939-45 war but were not sent to war zones be considered eligible for defence service home loans.
- Mr Jarman—from certain citizens praying that steps be taken to allow child-care expenses as a deductible item from taxpayers' assessable income.
- Mr Johnson—from certain citizens praying that the proposed 17½ per cent sales tax on manufactured pet foods be withdrawn.
- Mr Johnson—from certain citizens praying that the 1981 Budget amendments to the sales tax legislation be repealed and the Sales Tax Amendment Bills be withdrawn.
- Mr Johnson—from certain citizens praying that the national roads construction program not be subjected to the tendering system.
- Mr Johnson—from certain residents of Australia praying that urgent steps be taken to formulate and approve a social security agreement with the Italian Government and that certain questions related to pensions of Italian immigrants be urgently resolved within such an agreement.
- Mr Kent—from certain citizens praying that any proposal to sell Trans Australia Airlines be rejected.
- Mr Kent—from certain citizens praying that the present children's service program be maintained and no recommendations of the Spender report be implemented without full consultation with community groups.
- Mr McLeay—from certain citizens praying that the decision to dispose of all census forms be reconsidered.
- Mr Millar—from certain citizens praying that the Government's sales tax legislation be withdrawn or repealed.
- Mr Mountford—from certain citizens praying that disabled people be recognised as citizens who should have equal rights and that certain actions be taken to enable adequate planning of services needed by partially or totally disabled people be undertaken.

Mr Scholes—from certain residents of Victoria praying that the Institute of Early Childhood Development be allowed to continue to operate as an independent and autonomous institution.

Mr Scott—from certain residents of South Australia praying that home loans on the same terms as those offered to certain Members of Parliament be extended to young couples in South Australia.

Petitions received.

9 **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION BILL 1981:** The order of the day having been read for the further consideration of the Bill in committee, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole.

—————
In the committee

Clause 40—

Mr Bowen (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) moved—That the clause be omitted, and the following clause be substituted:

Documents concerning certain operations of agencies

“40. A document is an exempt document if its disclosure under this Act—

- (a) would, or could reasonably be expected to—
 - (i) prejudice the effectiveness of procedures or methods for the conduct of tests, examinations or audits by an agency;
 - (ii) prejudice the attainment of the objects of particular tests, examinations or audits conducted or to be conducted by an agency;
 - (iii) have a substantial adverse effect on the management or assessment of personnel by the Commonwealth or by any agency; or
 - (iv) have a substantial adverse effect on the conduct by or on behalf of the Commonwealth or an agency of industrial relations negotiations; and
- (b) would be contrary to the public interest.”

Debate continued.

Question—That the clause proposed to be omitted stand part of the Bill—put and passed.

Clauses 41 to 43, by leave, taken together.

Mr Bowen, by leave, moved the following amendments together:

Clause 43—

Page 28, omit paragraphs (b) and (c) of sub-clause (1), substitute the following word and paragraph:

“or (b) information (other than trade secrets) concerning a person in respect of his business or professional affairs or concerning the business, commercial or financial affairs of an organisation or undertaking, being information—

- (i) the disclosure of which would, or could reasonably be expected to, unreasonably disadvantage that person in respect of his lawful business or professional affairs or that organisation or undertaking in respect of its lawful business, commercial or financial affairs; or
- (ii) the disclosure of which under this Act would, or could reasonably be expected to, impair the ability of the Commonwealth or of an agency to obtain information of a similar kind to that contained in the document in the future for the purpose of the administration of matters administered by an agency.”

Page 28, omit sub-clause (3), substitute the following sub-clauses:

“(3) A document is an exempt document if its disclosure under this Act would disclose information (other than trade secrets) concerning the business, commercial or financial affairs of an undertaking that is carried on by, or by an authority of, the Commonwealth, being information the disclosure of which under this Act—

- (a) would, or could reasonably be expected to, unreasonably disadvantage that undertaking in respect of its lawful business, commercial or financial affairs; and
- (b) would be contrary to the public interest.

“(4) A reference in sub-sections (1) and (2) to an undertaking includes a reference to an undertaking that is carried on by, or by an authority of, a State, the Northern Territory or a local Government authority.”.

Debate continued.

Amendments negatived.

Clauses agreed to.

Clause 44—

Mr Bowen moved—That the clause be omitted, and the following clause be substituted:

Documents affecting national economy

“44. A document is an exempt document if its disclosure under this Act—

- (a) could reasonably be expected to result in an undue benefit or detriment to any person or class of persons by reason of giving premature knowledge of or concerning proposed or possible action or inaction of the Government or Parliament of the Commonwealth in the course of, or for the purpose of, managing the national economy; and
- (b) would be contrary to the public interest.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That the clause proposed to be omitted stand part of the Bill—put and passed.

Clauses 45 to 52, by leave, taken together, and agreed to.

Proposed new Part—

Mr Bowen, by leave, moved—That the following new Part VA (comprising clauses 52A to 52G) be inserted in the Bill:

“PART VA—ROLE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

Interpretation

“52A. In this Part—

- (a) a reference to the taking of action has the same meaning as it has for the purposes of the *Ombudsman Act 1976*; and
- (b) action shall be deemed to have been taken by an agency in the circumstances in which it would be deemed to be so taken for the purposes of the *Ombudsman Act 1976*.

Complaints to Ombudsman

“52B. (1) Subject to this Act, a person may complain to the Ombudsman concerning action taken by an agency or by a Minister in the exercise of powers or the performance of functions under this Act.

“(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or in sub-section 6 (3) of the *Ombudsman Act 1976* but subject to sub-section 6 (2) of that Act, the exercise of the powers of the Ombudsman under the *Ombudsman Act 1976* in respect of matters arising under this Act is not precluded or restricted by reason of the rights conferred on persons by this Act to make applications to the Tribunal.

“(3) Where a complaint is made to the Ombudsman under the *Ombudsman Act 1976* concerning action taken by an agency in the exercise of powers or the performance of functions under this Act, an application to the Tribunal for a review

of the decision shall not be made before the Ombudsman has informed the applicant of the result of the complaint in accordance with section 12 of the *Ombudsman Act* 1976.

(4) Notwithstanding anything contained in the *Ombudsman Act* 1976, a report under that Act to a complainant in respect of a complaint arising out of a request under this Act shall not contain information of the kind referred to in sub-section 24 (1) of this Act.

Ombudsman may designate a Deputy Ombudsman for freedom of information matters

“52C. (1) The Ombudsman shall, by notice published in the *Gazette*, designate a Deputy Ombudsman as the Deputy Ombudsman for freedom of information matters.

“(2) In relation to any action taken by a Minister or an agency in the exercise of any power or the performance of any function conferred by this Act, the Deputy Ombudsman for freedom of information matters has all the powers, and may exercise all the functions, of the Commonwealth Ombudsman under the *Ombudsman Act* 1976, other than the power of the Commonwealth Ombudsman to report to the Parliament under section 17 or 19 of that Act.

“(3) Nothing in this section prevents the exercise of a power or the performance of a function by the Commonwealth Ombudsman under the *Ombudsman Act* 1976 in relation to action of the kind referred to in sub-section (2).

“(4) In this section, a reference to the *Ombudsman Act* 1976 shall be construed—

- (a) unless paragraph (b) applies—as a reference to that Act as modified in the manner provided in sections 52A and 52B of this Act; or
- (b) in relation to a complaint concerning action taken by a Minister—as a reference to the *Ombudsman Act* 1976 as modified and adapted in accordance with the regulations made under section 52F.

Reports made by the Ombudsman

“52D. (1) Where, in the course of an investigation by the Ombudsman in relation to an action taken by an agency in the exercise of powers or the performance of functions under this Act—

- (a) the Ombudsman has referred evidence concerning an officer to a Minister or to a principal officer under sub-section 8 (10) of the *Ombudsman Act* 1976; and
 - (b) that officer is employed under the *Public Service Act* 1922,
- the Ombudsman shall furnish a copy of that evidence to the Public Service Board.

“(2) Where, after an investigation by the Ombudsman in relation to action taken by a Department in the exercise of powers or the performance of functions under this Act, a report is made to the Department by the Ombudsman under sub-section 15 (2) of the *Ombudsman Act* 1976, the Ombudsman shall furnish a copy of the report to the Public Service Board.

“(3) Each annual report required to be submitted to the Minister by the Ombudsman under paragraph 19 (1) (a) of the *Ombudsman Act* 1976, and each additional report submitted to the Minister by the Ombudsman under sub-section 19 (2) of that Act—

- (a) shall include a report on the operations of the Ombudsman during the year, or the part of a year, to which the report relates with respect to complaints made to the Ombudsman or investigations commenced or completed by the Ombudsman concerning action taken by agencies or by a Minister in the exercise of powers or the performance of functions conferred by this Act; and
- (b) may include—
 - (i) such observations as the Ombudsman sees fit to make concerning the operation of this Act during the year, or the part of a year, to which the report relates; and

- (ii) such recommendations as the Ombudsman sees fit to make concerning ways in which public access to documents of agencies or to official documents of Ministers might be better secured.

Documents of agencies claimed to be exempt under section 28, 28A, 29 or 30

“52E. (1) Where—

- (a) the Ombudsman has commenced an investigation of a decision made under this Act not to grant a request for access to a document; and
 (b) a certificate is furnished to the Ombudsman under paragraph 9 (3) (a), (c) or (d) of the *Ombudsman Act 1976* in relation to that investigation,

the certificate shall not be taken to affect the right of the Ombudsman to seek from any person the reasons for any decision made under this Act that the document is an exempt document or to require any person to furnish any information or to answer any questions concerning that decision.

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph 9 (3) (b) of the *Ombudsman Act 1976*, the Attorney-General is not empowered to furnish to the Ombudsman a certificate under that paragraph in relation to an investigation commenced by the Ombudsman into a decision made under this Act not to grant a request for access to a document in accordance with a request.

Investigation by the Ombudsman of action taken by Ministers

“52F. (1) The Minister administering this Act shall cause to be made by the date of commencement of this Part regulations that make provision for the modification and adaptation of the provisions of the *Ombudsman Act 1976* so as to enable complaints concerning action taken by Ministers under this Act to be made to the Ombudsman and dealt with by him in a manner substantially similar to the manner in which complaints concerning action taken by agencies under this Act are made to the Ombudsman and dealt with by him.

“(2) Where a complaint concerning action taken by a Minister under this Act is made to the Ombudsman under the *Ombudsman Act 1976* as modified and adapted in accordance with regulations made under sub-section (1), sub-section 5 (2) of the *Ombudsman Act 1976* shall not be taken to prevent the investigation of the complaint.

“(3) Where a complaint concerning action taken by a Minister under this Act is made to the Ombudsman under the *Ombudsman Act 1976* as modified and adapted in accordance with regulations made under sub-section (1), sub-section 6 (3) of the *Ombudsman Act 1976* shall not be taken to prevent the investigation of the complaint in a case where the complainant has not exercised a right to have that action reviewed under section 45 of this Act.

Ombudsman may represent persons in proceedings before the Tribunal

“52G. (1) The Ombudsman may represent, or arrange for another person to represent, any person who makes application to the Tribunal, under section 55 for review of a decision, not being a decision made under sections 33 and 33A of this Act in the proceedings before the Tribunal pursuant to that application, if the Ombudsman is of the opinion, in all the circumstances of the case, that it is reasonable for him to do so.

“(2) Without limiting the generality of the matters to which the Ombudsman may have regard in deciding whether to represent an applicant in proceedings before the Tribunal under section 55, the Ombudsman shall have regard to—

- (a) the importance of the principle involved in the matter under review;
 (b) the likelihood that the proceedings will establish a precedent in future proceedings;
 (c) the financial means of the applicant;
 (d) the applicant's prospect of success; and
 (e) the reasonableness of the decision under review.”.

Debate ensued.

Proposed new Part negatived.

Clauses 53 to 59, by leave, taken together, and agreed to.

Proposed new clause—

Mr Bowen moved—That the following new clause be inserted in the Bill:

Review of certain decisions in respect of documents relating to the Governments of the States or the Northern Territory

“59A. (1) Where notice of a decision that a document, so far as it contains information, is not an exempt document under section 33A has been given, in accordance with sub-section 33B (2), to the Government of a State or the Northern Territory which made submissions in accordance with that section, that Government may apply to the Tribunal for a review of that decision.

“(2) Where an application is made in accordance with sub-section (1)—

- (a) the provisions of this Part (other than sections 55 and 61) apply in like manner as they apply in relation to an application for review of a decision refusing to grant access to a document; and
- (b) the agency or Minister concerned shall forthwith inform the person who made the request of the application.

“(3) Where—

- (a) upon a request referred to in sub-section 33A (1), a decision is made, after the making of submissions by the Government of a State or the Northern Territory in accordance with that sub-section, not to grant access to the document to which the request relates, so far as it contains the information referred to in paragraph 33A (1) (a); and
- (b) an application is made to the Tribunal for a review of the decision, the agency or Minister concerned shall forthwith inform the Government of the State or the Northern Territory which made the submissions of the application.”.

Debate ensued.

Proposed new clause negatived.

Clauses 60 to 65, by leave, taken together, and agreed to.

Proposed new clause—

Mr Bowen moved—That the following new clause be inserted in the Bill:

Tribunal may award costs in certain circumstances

“65A. (1) Where—

- (a) a person, after having made a complaint to the Ombudsman in respect of action taken by an agency or a Minister under this Act, subsequently makes application to the Tribunal under section 55 for review of a decision constituting or comprised in the action to which the complaint relates;
- (b) the person is successful, or substantially successful, in his application for review; and
- (c) in a case where the decision is not a decision to provide access to a document—the person had sought representation by the Ombudsman before the Tribunal but the Ombudsman had declined to represent the applicant, the Tribunal may, in its discretion, recommend to the Attorney-General that the costs of the applicant in relation to the proceedings be paid by the Commonwealth.

“(2) Without limiting the generality of the matters to which the Tribunal may have regard in deciding whether to make a recommendation under sub-section (1), the Tribunal shall have regard to—

- (a) the question whether the decision of the Tribunal will be of benefit to the general public;
- (b) the question whether the decision of the Tribunal will be of commercial benefit to the person making application to the Tribunal; and
- (c) the reasonableness of the decision in relation to which the application to the Tribunal was made.”.

Debate ensued.

Proposed new clause negatived.

Clauses 66 to 94, by leave, taken together.

Mr Bowen moved the following amendment:

Clause 93, page 47, line 40, after "June" insert "but in any case not later than 31 October of that year".

Debate continued.

Amendment negatived.

Clauses agreed to.

Schedule 1 agreed to.

Schedule 2 debated.

Question—That Schedule 2 be agreed to—put.

The committee divided (the Deputy Chairman, Mr Giles, in the Chair)—

AYES, 64

Mr Adermann	Mr Connolly	Mr Hunt	Mr Peacock
Mr Baume	Mr Cowan	Mr Hyde	Mr Porter
Mr Birney	Mr Dean	Mr Jarman	Mr Robinson
Mr Bouchier	Mr Dobie	Mr Jull	Mr Rocher
Mr Bradfield	Mr Drummond	Mr Katter	Mr Ruddock
Mr Braithwaite	Dr Edwards	Mr Killen	Mr Sainsbury
Mr N. A. Brown	Mr Falconer	Mr Lloyd	Mr Shack
Mr Bungey	Mr Fisher*	Sir Phillip Lynch	Mr Shipton
Mr Burr	Mr Goodluck	Mr MacKellar	Mr Spender
Mr Cadman	Mr Groom	Mr MacKenzie	Mr Street
Mr D. M. Cameron	Mr Hall	Mr McLean	Mr Tambling
Mr E. C. Cameron	Mr Harris	Mr Macphee	Mr Thomson
Mr I. M. D. Cameron	Mr Hicks	Mr Moore	Mr Tuckey
Mr Carlton	Mr Hodges*	Mr Newman	Mr Viner
Mr Chapman	Mr Hodgman	Mr Nixon	Mr White
Mr Coleman	Mr Howard	Mr O'Keefe	Mr Wilson

NOES, 47

Mr Armitage	Mrs Darling	Mr Johnson*	Mr Morris
Mr Beazley	Mr Dawkins	Mr B. O. Jones	Mr Morrison
Dr Blewett	Mr Duffy	Mr C. K. Jones	Mr Mountford
Mr Bowen	Dr Everingham	Mr Keating	Mr Scholes
Mr J. J. Brown	Mr Free	Mrs Kelly	Mr Scott
Mr R. J. Brown	Mr Hawke	Mr Kent	Dr Theophanous
Mr Campbell	Mr Holding	Mr Kerin	Mr Uren
Mr Charles	Mr Howe	Dr Klugman	Mr Wallis
Mrs Child	Mr Humphreys*	Mr McLeay	Mr West
Mr Cohen	Mr Hurford	Mr McMahon	Mr Willis
Mr Cross	Mr Jacobi	Mr Mildren	Mr Young
Mr Cunningham	Dr Jenkins	Mr Milton	

* Tellers

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Title agreed to.

Bill to be reported without amendment.

The House resumed; Mr Giles reported accordingly.

On the motion of Mr Viner (Minister representing the Attorney-General), the House adopted the report, and, by leave, the Bill was read a third time.

10 CANNED FRUITS MARKETING LEGISLATION REPEAL AND AMENDMENT BILL 1982:

The order of the day having been read for the resumption of the debate on the question—That the Bill be now read a second time—

Debate having been resumed by Mr Kerin—

11 **ADJOURNMENT:** It being 10 p.m.—The question was proposed—That the House do now adjourn.

Debate ensued.

The House continuing to sit until 10.30 p.m.—Mr Deputy Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: All Members were present (at some time during the sitting) except Mr McVeigh.

J. A. PETTIFER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives