Record of the
Proceedings of the Queensland Parliament
...
Legislative Assembly
2nd August 1860
...
Extracted from the third party account as published in the
Moreton Bay Courier 4th August 1860

The Speaker took the chair at 20 minutes past 3 o'clock, and read prayers.

QUESTION.

Mr. BUCKLEY asked the Colonial Secretary, pursuant to notice, if any provision had been made for administering the Government of the colony, by the appointment of certain officers in the event of death or absence from the colony of the present head of the Executive?

In reply, the COLONIAL SECRETARY stated that it was provided in his Excellency's commission that in the event of his death or absence from the colony the government should be administered by the Colonial Secretary, but as that officer was removable by the votes of the legislature, his Excellency had communicated with the Imperial authorities on the subject of the appointment of some other officer or officers not so inconveniently situated, but had not yet had time to receive any answer to his communication.

PETITION.

Mr JORDAN presented a petition from Dr. Hobbs, as chairman of a public meeting of the citizens of Brisbane, praying the house to refuse its assent to the establishment of the principle of pre-emptive right in the bill now under consideration for the "Occupation of Unoccupied Crown Lands;" and praying the Assembly, further, to adopt the principle of a periodical valuation of the runs, to estimate not their mere grazing capabilities but their real value.

The petition having been read by the clerk, it was received on the motion of Mr. JORDAN, seconded by Mr. RAFF.

UNOCCUPIED CROWN LANDS OCCUPATION BILL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the adoption of the report of the committee of the whole on this bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, having seconded the motion, Mr. RAFF moved as an amendment— That the bill be recommitted with a view to the consideration of the amendments of which he had given notice.

Mr. BUCKLEY seconded the amendment, which was put and passed.

On the motion of Mr. RAFF, the Speaker left the chair, and the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to reconsider the bill in detail.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL having postponed the preamble, moved that clause 1 stand part of the bill.

Mr. RAFF moved as an amendment that in the 23rd line, after the word "of," the word "the area and" be inserted.

The question was put and carried.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved, as a further amendment, that the blank in the 4th

line should be filled up by the insertion of the words “Commencement of this Act,” and that the figures “1860” be omitted.

The amendments having been seconded by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, were respectively put and passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, moved that clause 2 stand part of the bill.

Mr. BUCKLEY considered that the clause proposed to deal unfairly with a class of persons with whom contracts had been entered into by the Government. The house was bound to keep faith with these persons, and to avoid anything like repudiation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY explained that it was the intention of the Government to keep faith with all parties, and that the present bill was for the settlement of lands hitherto unoccupied, and did not apply to the settled districts at all. It proposed to enter into new engagements, and not to repudiate or to interfere with old ones.

The clause having been passed, the ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 3 stand as part of the bill.

Mr. WATTS moved as an amendment, that after the words “Crown Lands,” in the 41st line, there be inserted the words “such commissioners to be surveyors,” He said it was highly desirable that the commissioners be competent to mark out properly the boundary of runs and to determine their area, and he thought it would save much time and trouble to insist on the appointment of none but duly qualified surveyors to the office of commissioners.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY and Mr. TAYLOR having objected to the motion on the ground that professional gentlemen like surveyors would not accept such salaries as were provided for the commissioners, and that other persons could be found to do the simple duties as well, Mr. WATTS, with leave of the committee, withdrew his amendment, and the clause as originally read was put and passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 4 stand part of the bill.

Mr. BLAKENEY moved a necessary verbal amendment, which was put and passed.

A subsequent amendment on the 7th line, providing that after the word “demand” there be inserted “by payment of a fee of two shillings and sixpence,” was put and carried, with a view to prevent persons from unnecessarily applying to have the books kept as registries for the various runs produced for examination.

Several verbal amendments having been made in the clause, it was put and passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 5 stand part of the bill.

Mr. BLAKENEY moved two verbal amendments, which were put and passed, after which the clause was agreed to.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 6 stand part of the bill.

Mr JORDAN said when this clause was considered in committee before, he suggested that instead of 100 square miles, 200 should be fixed as the maximum of any run. At present the bill did not fix any limit to the number of contiguous runs a squatter might be permitted to take up. He would therefore propose that any person holding four contiguous runs of 25 square miles each, or two of 100 square miles each, should not be compelled to stock each of them to within a fourth of their estimated carrying capabilities, but should be permitted to regard the whole as one, and stock it accordingly. Under the present bill, a squatter with half-a-dozen runs would have to form as many stations; and in the outlying districts such an arrangement would be not only highly inconvenient and costly, but attended with considerable danger from the blacks.

Mr. BROUGHTON said the amendment was nothing more nor less than a proposal to increase the maximum of runs from 100 to 200 square miles. The object of the bill was to provide for the settlement of the country as extensively as possible, but if the amendment were carried, that object would be in a great measure defeated.

Mr. TAYLOR grew more surprised every time the hon. member for North Brisbane (Mr. Jordan) rose to speak on the squatting question. He always thought that gentleman advocated the claims of the small man, as he was called, but he was now proposing to legislate exclusively for the man of capital. He said that a person having 200 square miles of country may put his sheep in one corner of the block, and leave the rest unstocked. Without a clause defining the proportion which the depth of a run shall bear to its length, and with the proposal of Mr. Jordan in force, a man will be able to take up thirty or sixty miles of water frontage with a depth of only a few miles. It is well known that a squatter can very rarely find a square block of 100 square miles of country good throughout, for however good its frontage may be the good country seldom extends so far back as ten miles, and generally not further than four or five. On the Dawson the squatters found the good country only in narrow strips, and could not go further back in many cases than two or three miles. Hence, if Mr. Jordan's amendment were carried a man would have a long narrow tract of country with his sheep at one end of it, and people would have to go long distances from one inhabited place to another, and the consequence would be that there would be greater danger from the blacks than ever. He was perfectly astonished at the amendment coming as it did from a quarter, and he (Mr. Taylor), believed the hon. member for North Brisbane would have gone the length of proposing 400 instead of 200 square miles as the maximum had he not been checked and persuaded in the house to the contrary.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS thought the amendment a very good one, and would support it if the committee divided. In newly occupied country it was necessary that the stock and people should be kept as much together as possible; as if they were divided into small fractions and placed at a distance from one another greater danger would arise from the hostility of the blacks.

The amendment of Mr. Jordan having then been put, the committee divided with the following result:—

Ayes, 10.		Noes, 11.	
Mr. Herbert		Mr. Taylor	
" Pring		" Watts	
" Thorn		" Coxon	
" Richards		" Moffatt	
" Jordan		" Fleming	
" Broughton		" O'Sullivan	
" Royds		" Lilley	
" Ferrett		" Raff	
" Haly	} Tellers	" Buckley	
" Fitzsimmons	}	" Blakeney	} Tellers
		" Edmondstone	}

The clause as originally proposed was then put and carried.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL proposed that clause 7 stand part of the bill.

Mr. BUCKLEY proposed that "ninety" instead of "sixty" days be allowed to parties after obtaining licenses for the payment of the necessary fees into the treasury.

The amendment having been carried, the clause was passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 8 stand part of the bill.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved as an amendment that the leases be granted for five instead of fourteen years, but subsequently withdrew his motion to admit of the introduction of another on a subsequent clause by Mr. Raff.

Mr. LILLEY remembered that on a previous occasion a clause was passed on the supposed understanding that a certain amendment on a subsequent clause would be agreed to when it was afterwards discovered that the house refused to sanction the amendment. He thought it would be prudent to postpone the present clause till after Mr. Raff's amendment had been disposed of, lest misunderstanding might arise.

The clause was accordingly postponed.

Clauses 9, 10, and 11, were then severally proposed by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL and passed, with a few unimportant verbal alterations.

On clause 12 being proposed, Mr. RAFF moved the amendment of which he had given notice, and which he had proposed on the first committal of the bill. He considered the principle of periodical valuation of the runs was the most equitable and reasonable one to arrive at the exact estimate of their value that could be adopted. As the squatters could be liberally dealt with in obtaining fixity of tenure there could be no objection on this part to pay to the country the proper price to be fixed by valuation of their runs.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY considered the maximum proposed in the amendment for the second valuation was too high. To fix it at £70 was to place too much power in the hands of the Government and of the commissioners over the squatters.

Mr. TAYLOR said if the maximum were reduced to £60 he would support the amendment.

Mr. LILLEY considered that if a maximum of £70 were fixed, it did not follow that the maximum would be always charged. The runs were to be valued fairly by the representatives of the squatters and of the Government, and disputes settled by arbitration, and he did not see why, if a run was really worth £70, and was valued at that price, the squatter should not be required to pay the full amount.

Mr. HALY would support the proposal to fix the maximum at £70, as the minimum had been reduced.

Mr. BLAKENEY said disputes would be settled by arbitration, and the squatters would be on equal terms with the commission; and if the valuation was excessive they could appeal to the Government.

Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. WATTS spoke in favour of the principle of the amendment; the latter gentleman suggested, however, that the minimum should be reduced from £35 to £25; for if that was not done, only the best parts of the country would be taken up, and much that would not be worth £35 would lie unoccupied and unstocked.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS thought it would be better to put it out of the power of the commissioners to fix the valuation at oppressive rates. He was in favor of reducing the maximum to £60.

Mr. RAFF was ready to adopt any reasonable suggestions, but he did not consider £70 too high a maximum. He thought the proposal of the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba a very good one however, and would, with permission of the committee, embody it in his amendment.

The amendment was then put and carried, and the clause put and passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 13 stand part of the bill.

Mr. RAFF moved an amendment to the effect that the valuation arrived at in every case should be published in the ‘Government Gazette,’ and that the government should have the right of appointing the umpires to decide between the squatter and the commissioner as to the value of a run.

Mr. TAYLOR objected to the amendment, as it would actually give the government the power of upsetting the decision of the squatter and the commissioner, who had a better opportunity of judging on the spot.

Mr. RAFF admitted that the hon. member was right in his interpretation. The government would have much larger powers than this, however, under the provisions of the bill. For instance, the power of the resumption of the whole or any part of runs required for public purposes. He could, therefore, see no objection to the additional power now proposed to be entrusted to them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY was in favor of the plan originally proposed, although he

thought the suggestion in the amendment with regard to the publication of the valuation might be very judiciously adopted.

Mr. WATTS thought that the operation of the clause as amended would act mischievously, and that it would grant powers to the government which they had no right to look for. Both the squatter and the government had a right to be represented at the estimating of the value of a run; but he did not see why the government should be doubly represented.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the bill only proposed that the government should have power to appoint an umpire when in case of dispute between the squatter and commissioner, the former refused to do so. But the amendment proposed to appoint an umpire whether the squatter wishes for one or not. It did not give the squatter fair play, and he would therefore vote against it. He explained the principles of arbitration, which were altogether overlooked in the amendment, and held that if one party had larger powers than the other there could be no arbitration at all.

Mr. BUCKLEY would support the amendment as he thought it would achieve two important objects—1st, publicity for all the transactions, and 2nd, control of any commissioner who might be desirous of acting improperly.

The amendment having been altered, as suggested by Mr. O'Sullivan, by merely adding to the clause as it originally stood, the words "and every valuation made under the act shall be forwarded to the 'Government Gazette' for publication within one month," was put and carried.

Clause 14 was then proposed by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL and passed after a few verbal alterations had been made at the suggestion of Mr. Blakeney.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL proposed clause 15.

Mr. HALY moved an amendment to the effect that in case of drought, disease, or flood, or other such unfortunate occurrences, the squatter should not be compelled to keep his run stocked to the extent of one-fourth of its carrying capabilities.

Mr. LILLEY could not see the necessity for the amendment, as such cases as had been referred to were already provided for in the clause. He pointed out the words "except in case of unavoidable accidents" in support of his assertion. Besides it was not necessary to make such large provisions for the squatter; they were contrary to all principle and practice. If he (Mr. Lilley) lost half a dozen clients by any accident, his landlord would not remit any portion of his rent in consequence.

Mr. BROUGHTON said the rent was so reasonable and moderate under the bill that the squatters had no right to ask for compensation.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL considered the amendment against all principle. The government held out inducements to people to take up stations, but left it to them to take up the stations or not. They were not entitled to compensation from the government, but should establish insurance companies and protect themselves.

The committee divided on Mr. Haly's amendment, which was negatived on a division by a majority of 19 to 2, Messrs. Haly and Ferrett being the minority. The clause was then put, and passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL proposed clause 16.

Mr. JORDAN proposed, as an amendment, that the clause be omitted. The squatters had now granted to them security of tenure, and he thought they were found to give up the pre-emptive right.

Mr. MOFFATT was of opinion that the attempt to deprive the squatters of the right of buying their homesteads after erecting them would interfere with the settlement of the country, for no man would make large improvements on his run if they were to be taken away from him.

Mr. BLAKENEY denounced the pre-emptive right, and would support the amendment providing for its abolition.

Mr. BUCKLEY had lost his previous amendment in favor of the granting of the right of pre-emption to squatters over 160 acres of land for such permanent improvements as the sinking of wells implied, and having lost that amendment, he would vote for the total abolition of the right, as he did not think it was now worth anything to the squatters.

Mr. TAYLOR expressed his determination to vote for the abolition of the right, as he saw that there was such a desire on the part of hon. members to deal fairly and honestly by the squatters.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL would vote for the clause, because, independently of his opinion in favor of the principle embodied in it, it had been twice affirmed already—first, on the second reading of the bill, and afterwards when the clause was discussed and carried in committee. Such being the case, he would not be so void of common sense as to refuse to endorse now the sentiments he had deliberately expressed, after calm consideration, then. If he had good grounds for recanting, he would find words to state them, and not do so in silence, like some honourable members, without a sign of explanation. He was in the habit of considering what he was to do in that house, and voted neither hastily nor thoughtlessly, and he would advise others to do the same, and know their own minds, before they attempted to express their opinions or record their votes. It had been said that the pre-emptive right was valueless to the squatter, and that as it was proposed to be established in the present bill, it would never be exercised; and it was asked why therefore should the principle be retained. He thought if the right were regarded as really so valueless as it had been represented to be, there was no necessity for making such a clamour against it, or for taking such great pains to abolish it. He advocated the continuation of the right, because he desired to see the country settled permanently with men and not occupied by herds of mere sheep and cattle, and to afford the fullest scope for such settlement, and the fairest inducements to people engaged in pastoral pursuits to remain in the country, he would support the exercise of the right, as it enabled man to improve his run, and gave him the opportunity of possessing himself of his improvements without injury to the interests of the public. What man would build an expensive and comfortable residence, would erect schools or churches, would spend his money in clearing and improving the waste lands, if the Government were allowed to step in and deprive him of his improvements either with or without pecuniary compensation. The hon. member for North Brisbane (Mr. Blakeney) amused him much. The degree of consistency he had observed with regard to the expression of his opinions on the question of right was it itself remarkable, and was perfectly amazing to contemplate. A few evenings ago that hon. member voted for the pre-emptive right, to day he had spoken in no measured terms against it. On the former occasion he proposed to grant the right of pre-emption over the 160 acres of country to the squatters for every well they might find it convenient to sink on their runs. No advocate of the pre-emptive right could have expressed himself more strongly in favour of it than the hon. member did by that vote. It left no doubt on his (the Attorney-General's) mind that the hon. member had the greatest respect for the right, since he proposed to carry it to so unlimited an extent. Now, however, the hon. and learned gentleman delivered himself like an oracle of a tirade against the very principle of the right, expressed his firm determination to resist its exercise even in the mildest and most limited degree as proposed in the bill, and declared that he would not permit its continuance any longer as it had been the great public grievance and must needs be redressed by the representatives of the people. The hon. member was at least a little inconsistent. If he made a mistake he should rise and acknowledge his error and not silently repudiate his former vote. He (the Attorney-General), thought the hon. member had lately got a fright which shewed him that he had been on the wrong side on a recent occasion, and that it became necessary for him to set himself right with the people outside. But if such were the case what could be said of the conduct of the hon. member for East Moreton (Mr. Buckley?) That gentleman brought up the amendment which proposed to grant almost unlimited exercise of the pre-emptive right. That hon. member claimed the distinguished honour of having been the author of the well scheme. The proposal was grandiloquently made, but the honourable member was checkmated by the good sense of the house and his pet proposal was thrown out. On the rejection of his amendment he voted for the pre-emptive right as proposed to be established by

the bill. But in two or three days he turned round and scornfully rejected the miserable pittance and would support the right no longer. After due deliberation and considerable consultation he came down to the house and told us the pre-emptive right was a horrible system to be tolerated no longer The hon. member for the Western Downs had acted a little inconsistently too in this matter; but he had spoken out honestly, and he believed acted honestly throughout, for he explained that when he voted for the right on a previous discussion of the bill, he was not aware, like many other hon. members, of the amendment intended to be proposed by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. He had been true to his principles, and said now as he had said before, that if the squatter got value for his improvements he got all that he had a right to expect.

Mr. BLAKENEY complained of the manner in which the Attorney-General had spoken of hon. members in that house equally true to their principles as himself. He thought when the hon. member got up to lecture others he should be more accurate in his statements. On the last occasion when the pre- emptive right was under discussion he not only voted but spoke against it. He voted for Mr. Buckley's motion because he thought well-sinking ought to be encouraged, as it tended materially to improve the country.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the hon. member voted in favour of a proposal to extend the pre-emptive right in a manner never contemplated by the government, and establish it in the worst possible form.

Mr. TAYLOR would not get into a passion. The Attorney-General had let him down very easily, while he had given a considerable dressing down to others. As to the little inconsistency that had been observed in his conduct, he felt that his votes would bear comparison with those of the Attorney-General even, but as that hon. gentleman had let him down easily he would do the same and say no more.

Mr. LILLEY did not consider, with the Attorney-General, that pre-emptive right was the principal or a leading or an important principle of the bill, otherwise he would not have voted for its second reading. He regarded the bill as a measure to promote pastoral occupation, and to abolish the abuses that he prevailed under the tendering system. The right was valueless, then why not strike it out of the bill. Let the thing go if it be worthless, and the bill would receive the approbation of the whole country. Mr. Lilley defended the line of conduct pursued by Mr. Buckley and others.

Mr. BROUGHTON had voted for the pre-emptive right before, but as it had been provided that a squatter could get value for his improvements, he considered the right was no longer required, and he would, therefore, now vote against it.

Mr. THORN was decidedly in favour of the clause, and would go further than it proposed, and not permit merely the squatter to purchase part of his run, but compel him to do so, as he did not improve the country by depasturing his stock upon it, but exhausted and ruined it.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS could see no reason why the squatters should be debarred the privilege of the pre-emptive right, seeing that the land they purchased would be of no use to the working classes, about whom so much had been said.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he desired to accord every respect to the opinion of the public, and with regard to the respectable deputation who had waited on him, the orderly and correct conduct of the late public meeting, and the temperate speeches delivered by those who took part in it, he could not speak otherwise than in terms of unqualified respect. He looked upon the conduct of that meeting as highly creditable to Queensland, but at the same time he must confess that he had not been convinced by any of the arguments advanced.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN was opposed to the pre-emptive right, although it was by no means improbable that he would very shortly become a squatter himself. In point of means he was just as well qualified as any member in the house to take up the pursuit. With regard to the main point, he contended that by giving the squatters the land at a merely nominal price they were virtually giving away the rightful inheritance of their children. In arriving at this opinion, he never looked at the weathercock to see which way the political wind was blowing. If, as the squatters

said, the land in question was of no use to the working classes, he was at a loss to understand of what use it could be to them. This difficulty as to value might be obviated by causing the land to be appraised, and fixing a price upon it in accordance with the appraisement. As to the argument about churches having been built on the land, he could not see what reference it had to the remote districts, where from the want of population, churches would be useless. He was aware that many good runs had been rendered valueless to other people through the waterholes having been bought up under the pre-emptive right.

Mr. JORDAN objected to the principle of the pre-emptive right on the ground that it involved class legislation of the worst possible description, and also because the pre-emptive right had not answered the ends intended. Among other things it was thought that the granting of this land would lead to the erection of splendid brick buildings and the laying out of vineyards, &c., but these intentions had not been realised. True, the squatter had erected huts, and made such other improvements, but these were such as he could not possibly dispense with. Neither did he even purchase the land until the last moment, when it might be wanted for public purposes, so that the treasury did not receive the purchase money until it suited the squatter to buy, which in some cases, was not till many years after the occupancy commenced. A great many complimentary words had been uttered with regard to the late public meeting, but he reminded hon. members that the public expected something more substantial, otherwise they would naturally think that their opinion was treated with contempt. (No. no.)

Mr. WATTS was of opinion that as the fee simple of the paltry 160 acres was of no use to the squatter, it would be better to do away with it altogether, and therefore he would vote for the expungement of the clause.

The committee then divided on the motion for retaining the clause, with the following result:—

Ayes, 7.		Noes, 14.	
Mr. Moffatt		Mr. Jordan	
“ Royds		“ Taylor	
“ Ferrett		“ Lilley	
“ Fitzsimmons		“ Blakeney	
“ Thorn		“ Edmondstone	
“ Herbert	} Tellers.	“ Haly	
“ Pring	}	“ O’Sullivan	
		“ Watts	
		“ Broughton	
		“ Coxen	
		“ Fleming	
		“ Richards	
		“ Buckley	} Tellers
		“ Raff	}

The clause was therefore negatived.

Clause 17, on the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, was omitted from the bill.

Clause 18, grants for public purposes, was passed without opposition, as was also clause 19, providing for the resumption of runs.

On clause 20, enabling the value of improvements to be claimed in resumption of runs being proposed.

Mr. LILLEY moved several amendments designed more surely to carry out the object contemplated, the principal of which were to provide ample compensation for improvements, and to prevent the purchase of improvements in the event of the lease being renewed.

Mr. RAFF agreed with the amendments, but at the same time he thought some alteration ought to be made in the mode of valuation.

The amendments were carried as was also the clause in its amended form.

Clause 21 was passed without opposition.

Clause 22 was verbally amended on the motion of Mr. BLAKENEY.

Mr O'SULLIVAN moved with regard to the passage of stock through runs—that the words "or any other unavoidable accident" be inserted after the words "rain or flood."

The amendment was eventually negatived, and the clause agreed to.

Clause 23, empowering the government to grant licenses to cut timber on crown lands, leased or otherwise, was, after some discussion, amended on the motion of Mr. BROUGHTON by the insertion of a proviso giving the lessee a power to prevent persons from cutting timber on portions of runs calculated to injure the property of the squatter.

The remaining clauses, with some slight amendments, were passed without opposition.

The blanks in the last clause were filled up in such a way as to date the operation of the act from the 1st of October next, and the schedule attached was omitted altogether.

Mr TAYLOR asked the Colonial Secretary whether it was proposed to compel a squatter to put 1000 sheep on each block of land or the equivalent number of cattle.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied in the negative, observing that he understood the bill to mean that if a man took up four blocks contiguous they would merge into one run, the term used in the bill. After some discussion, in which Mr. BROUGHTON, Mr. JORDAN, THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, Mr. COXEN, Mr. WATTS, and Mr. LILLEY took part, the 8th clause, which had been postponed was put and passed.

The house then resumed and the report was adopted on the motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The third reading was fixed for the next day.

TENDERS REGULATION BILL.

This bill was recommitted for the purpose of amending certain clauses.

In clause 2 referring to tenders for runs already liable to rent,

Mr. BROUGHTON moved the insertion of the following words after the word "provided" in the 35th line, viz., "that no such parties shall be called on to pay more than one year's rent until the tenders shall have been finally reported on."

This, with several verbal amendments, was agreed to, and the clause carried.

In clause 3, authorising the government to grant leases of land tendered for,

Mr. BROUGHTON moved a proviso to the effect that the tenderer, upon application to the government, should claim within his lease according to the conditions stated, all lands not exceeding 100 square miles.

The amendment was carried together with the clause.

In clause 4, Mr. RAFF moved that all the words after the word "same" be omitted, with a view to inserting the following words—"To be fixed and payable at the rate and time, and ascertainable in the same manner as provided for in the Unoccupied Crown Lands Occupation Act of 1860."

The clause with the amendment was carried.

In clause 5, making provision for occupation,

Mr. BUCKLEY moved an amendment to the effect that should such runs not be stocked in the manner hereinbefore provided, the lessee would be liable to pay twice the rent, and if not stocked within a specified period he should forfeit his run altogether.

The amendment was carried and the clause passed.

Mr. MOFFATT asked whether runs under this bill could be obtained before the 1st of October, the date when the Unoccupied Crown Lands Occupation Bill would come into operation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY remarked that the date of the present bill had not yet been fixed, but apprehended the two bills would come into operation at the same time.

After some further conversation, it was finally agreed that the two bills should date from the same time.

The house resumed, and the report having been adopted, the third reading was fixed for the same day (Friday).

The house adjourned at 25 minutes to 1 o’clock until the same morning at 10 o’clock.