Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Council

FRIDAY, 5 DECEMBER 1884

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Friday, 5 *December*, 1884.

Electric Light.—Personal Explanation.—Order of Business.—Pharmacy Bill—consideration in committee of Legislative Assembly's amendments.—Jury Bill.—Divisional Boards Agricultural Drainage Bill—committee.—Maryborough and Urangan Railway Bill—committee.—Crown Lands Bill—committee.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4 o'clock.

ELECTRIC LIGHT.

The HON. W. FORREST said: Hon. gentlemen,—I yesterday gave notice that to-day I should move—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that steps be taken, with the least possible delay, for lighting this Chamber with electric light.

When we consider what we suffer in this Chamber in hot weather—the stifling, almost unbearable heat of the Chamber when lighted with gas, and, on the other hand, what a splendid brilliant light we may have that will not give any heat—I think I need not take up the time of the House in advocating the motion. I may say, however, that, supposing we do light the Chamber by electricity, there will be no necessity for doing away with gas, which, in cold weather, is very useful for the purpose of heating the Chamber. I may also point out that the other Chamber is now being lighted with the electric light. I beg to move the motion.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Hon. C. S. Mein): Hon. gentlemen,—I quite concur with the hon. gentleman in reference to this matter. I have seen the electric light used to light up rooms in various parts of the world with great success, and with great comfort to the persons occupying those rooms. The places where the electric light is chiefly used are in America; but there it is always the practice to have the gas turned on as well, so that, in the event of the electric machine breaking down, the gas will be available for lighting purposes. I think with a very little difficulty, and without interfering with the appearance of the Chamber at all, or with the present arrangements with regard to gas, it would be practicable to introduce the electric light. As to the comfort of that light, any person who has enjoyed both the convenience and pleasure of reading by it, and the absence of heat which follows its use, can have no second opinion about it. In most of the theatres in London they have introduced electric light with the most satisfactory results. In one of the most popular theatres in that city, when I was there some time ago, electricity was used, and in no single instance did the thermometer, during the most crowded evenings, exceed seventy-three in the middle of summer, whilst in most other places it was ninety. I am sure that, if introduced here during the summer months, the addition to the comfort of hon. gentlemen will be very great indeed. I believe some hon. gentlemen do not wish the supply of gas to be abandoned, because in the winter months its use warms the Chamber, and makes it somewhat more comfortable than it would be otherwise. We may still maintain the supply of gas, if necessary for use in that part of the year; but I quite agree with the Hon. Mr. Forrest that our work here is quite severe enough during the summer months without having our labours multiplied, as it were, by the inconvenience that arises from the large use of gas that is necessary to be employed whilst we are deliberating here.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said: Hon. gentlemen,—I think the chief objection to the electric light is generally the expense of installation, but in this case it has already been decided to light the Government Printing Office, where the engines will be placed, and the other Chamber by means of that light, and under those conditions the expense of lighting this Chamber would be comparatively small. Consequently it would be very desirable to avail ourselves of the opportunity of its use in this Chamber. We certainly could not very well dispense with the use of gas, which is the cheapest and most convenient mode of lighting the smaller parts of the building; but as regards the principal Chamber, I think it is highly important that we should avail ourselves of lighting it with electric light.

The HON. W. FORREST: I have very little to say in reply except this: that if the House approves of the electric light being used I hope it will not be carried out on the same system as in the other Chamber. Some time ago in Melbourne I went to an experimental lighting of a chamber by electric light, and although I cannot explain how it was done, I know that the light was very beautiful and pleasing to the eye; and I can remember well enough that it was not carried out in the same system as is adopted in the other Chamber. I do not think I need say anything more on the subject. I think the motion meets with the general approval of hon. members; but I repeat that I hope that before the system is agreed to it will be carefully considered.

Question put and passed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The HON. W. FORREST said: Hon. gentlemen,—I do not wish to move the adjournment of the House, but, with the permission of hon. members, I desire to make a short personal explanation, and at the same time to correct some errors that have crept into my speech as reported. The personal explanation is that under ordinary circumstances I should never have thought of making such corrections as I propose to make, but it is a question of figures, and, unless corrected, the sense of what I said will be spoiled. In page 9 of *Hansard* I am reported to have said, when speaking to the Hon. Mr. Gregory's amendment:—

"He considered that, at all events, the amendment should read, 'whose total holding in the district exceeds ten thousand acres.' If it were to apply to the whole area of the land held by a lessee within the colony, the lessee would not have the right to take up the balance of his run in such a case as that mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Gregory. He (Hon. Mr. Forrest) could give half-a-dozen cases where two men only held one block of about 25,000 or 30,000 square miles. If the half of that area was taken away the lessees would be left with only about 8,000 acres."

The mistakes are very palpable.

"He also knew another case in which four partners held 80,000 square miles, and if the half of that was resumed there would not be 80,000 acres left for each of the four men."

What I did say was that "he (Hon. Mr. Forrest) could give half-a-dozen cases where two men only held one block of 25 or 30 square miles, or, say, from 16,000 to 19,000 acres. If the half of that area was taken away, the lessee would be only left with about 8,000 or 9,000 acres. He also knew another case in which four partners held 180 square miles, and if half of that was resumed, there would not be 8,000 acres left to each of the four men after deducting the unavailable country." Then again, in page 12, in speaking to the Hon. Mr. Thynne's motion for bringing conditional selections under the Bill, I am reported as follows:—

"The Hon. W. FORREST said he would like to point out to the Committee what the interest could come to. In calculating it just now he found that the question was a much more serious one than hon. members appeared to imagine. The Act of 1876 permitted a selector to take up a conditional purchase of 5,280 acres, at 5s. an acre. If he paid 3d. a year on that for five years that would leave 3s. 9d.; and 5,000 acres at 3s. 9d. was £937. If the Government received 5 per cent. on that, they would actually get £460 interest."

It is easy to see the error there. I may say my speech there is very briefly reported, as I went rather fully into explanation in that speech. What I really said was this: "The Act of 1876 permitted a selector to take up a selection of 5,280 acres. Now, assuming that the selector under the Act of 1876 desires to come under this Bill, and that he holds 5,000 acres selected at 10s. per acre five years ago, he will already have paid 5s. per acre. Now, under the new rental, if he is assessed at 3d. per acre, 15d. would have to be deducted, thus leaving 3s. 9d. per acre in the Treasury; and 3s. 9d. per acre on 5,000 acres would give £937. Under the new Bill, it will take ten years to make the selection a freehold, and the interest on £937 at 5 per cent. for ten years will amount to £460." Further on, in speaking upon the same question, I am reported to have said—

"At present the selector paid his rent, and it went towards making his land a freehold—it went towards the reduction of the purchase money; but if he surrendered and came under the Bill he would have to pay the additional rental besides the rent he had paid before."

The end of that sentence ought to read thus: "but if he surrendered and came under the Bill, his rents in future would not be credited to him as part payment of the fee-simple of the land." Further on, on page 13, in speaking in reply to the Postmaster-General, I am reported as follows:—

"The Hon. W. FORREST said the Postmaster-General had pointed out that, beyond a few small stipulations at the beginning of the transaction, there was no bar after a certain time in selectors transferring. But he did not clearly explain what those few stipulations at the beginning of the transaction meant. They meant that a man could become a lessee—he was merely a licensee—until he fenced in his selection and performed certain other conditions."

What I ought to have been reported to say is this: "They meant that a man could *not* become a lessee; he was merely a licensee until he fenced in his selection or performed certain other conditions." Then, in pointing out the interest that accrues yearly on the amount of money paid into the Treasury for land purchased in fee-simple, I am reported to have said in the 3rd column, on page 13:—

"Now, the colony has been paying for money as much as 6, 7, and as high as 10 per cent., and he should now go into a calculation to show the saving of interest that might have been effected during the time that they had been paying those enormous rates. £8,000,000 at 5 per cent. gave a rental to the colony of £400,000 a year, and if he had gone really in excess of the amount that actually found its way into the Treasury—he might give it at £7,000,000 or £7,500,000, and take that at 4 per cent. and they would have a rental of £380,000, and that was not only for this year, but for all time.'

It is easy to see where the mistake is there. £380,000 should have been £280,000. What I said was: "and take that at 4 per cent. and they would have a rental of £280,000 or £300,000 a year, and that, not only for this year or next year, but for all time." Further on—

"There was that much being saved to the Treasury and the State every year. They got out of the unsettled districts £212,000, and out of the settled districts £21,000 a year, or a total of about £240,000."

What I said was that we got out of the unsettled districts for pastoral leases £212,000, and out of the settled districts £21,000, a year, of a total of about £240,000.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said: Hon. gentlemen,—There is some business on the paper that has been there for some time, and as I understand hon. gentlemen in charge of it are desirous of bringing it on, I beg to move that Orders of the Day 1, 2, and 3, be postponed until after the consideration of Orders of the Day 4, 5, and 6.

Question put and passed.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir A. H. Palmer): As a matter of practice, I may point out that if the usual course had been pursued, and the Order of Day had been called, I should have left the chair immediately, as the first Order is for the consideration of the Crown Lands Bill in Committee. The Postmaster-General, therefore, has taken the only course open to him by proposing this motion before the Order of the Day was called.

PHARMACY BILL — CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

On the motion of the HON. A. J. THYNNE, the House went into Committee to consider the Legislative Assembly's amendments upon this Bill.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said that the Bill had been returned to them from the Legislative Assembly with a message, which bore entirely upon section 5 of the Bill. That was the section which regulated the qualification of members of the board. An amendment was made in that Chamber upon the original Bill, which restricted very much the *personnel* of the members of the board. That amendment was to the effect that a member of the board must be a registered chemist and druggist who held a certificate of competency as a pharmaceutical chemist, or as a chemist and druggist from the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, or any college or board of pharmacy recognised by the board under the regulations; so that the members of the board, if not medical men, must be men who had already in their possession certificates from the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain. Amongst the chemists sufficiently accessible to be on the board here there were not enough possessing the qualifications required by that amendment to form the full number of the board. He did not think he could do better than to call hon. members' attention to the words of the message, a copy of which would be found in the Minutes of Proceedings of the Legislative Council of the 25th November. It was as follows:—

"The Legislative Assembly having taken into consideration the Legislative Council's message, of date the 12th instant, relative to the Pharmacy Bill,

"Insist upon the amendments in clause 5.—

"Because without them the Government would be limited in their choice of the members of the first pharmacy board to medical men, which would cause that board only to be a repetition of the present Medical Board."

That was the first reason given. The scheme and principle of the Bill altogether was to put into the hands of the chemists themselves, as a body of men, the regulation of their own affairs: and he thought after the discussions that had taken place from time to time, there and elsewhere, wherever the Pharmacy Bill had been introduced, would show the necessity that existed for putting chemists in an independent position, so that they might be able to do the best they could in their own line of business—he meant in the way of keeping the standard of qualification for the admission of members to it. As the Legislative Assembly in their message had stated that the amendment would cause the board to be only a repetition of the present Medical Board, he thought that if the amendment was insisted upon it would really render the Bill practically worthless for the object for which it had been introduced. The second reason given for objecting to the amendment was:—

"Because the members of the pharmacy board would not be of necessity examiners, but from their experience would be able to direct the lines on which examinations should be conducted, and to appoint examiners, whose specialties would be—Latin, botany, chemistry, etc."

That had evidently been directed to the argument used in favour of the amendment—that chemists were not as a body sufficiently educated of themselves to conduct the examinations required under the Bill. There was a great deal of reason in that statement by the Legislative Assembly. He would illustrate it by one circumstance. There was a board of examiners for attorneys in existence in this colony. Preliminary examinations were held prior to the admission of candidates to articles, and those examinations extended over the ordinary subjects of a liberal education. Latin was one of the absolutely necessary subjects, and he believed there was one other language included, but was not quite sure whether it was optional or compulsory. At those examinations the solicitors did not put a single paper. Examinations had been held here within the last month or two of candidates for admission as articled clerks; and the solicitors who were on the board, some of whom were men of the highest standing in this colony, both in their profession and as men of education, did not set a single paper. They simply deputed the whole examination to gentlemen whom they considered perfectly competent to set the papers and judge of the answers afterwards. Those gentlemen reported to the board, and the latter acted upon that report; so that the objection which had been taken—even if there was any foundation for it, which he did not admit—that the chemists were incapable of conducting the examinations themselves—was not a tangible objection. The third reason given by the Assembly was—

"Because the examination of candidates as to the knowledge of the qualities of drugs, and their ability to detect adulterations, can only be safely entrusted to men who have had great experience in the sale and purchase of drugs."

He did not think that he had any occasion to impress upon any member of that Committee the importance of that argument; it was self-evident. No man could test the capacity of another man with regard to his knowledge of any particular article so well as the man who was himself, by long experience, thoroughly acquainted with the article. The fourth reason given by the Assembly was—

"Because of the English Pharmacy Board very few of the members are themselves examiners."

He did not think that reason went far enough. As a matter of fact, not one of the members of the English Pharmacy Board was an examiner. He had not verified the information, but he had it on good authority that it was a rule—whether a strictly binding rule or one of etiquette, he could not say—that no member of the board should be an examiner. The next reason given by the Assembly was as follows:—

"Because it is not unusual in academical bodies that examinations for degrees or diplomas should be in part conducted by persons not themselves holding the degree or diploma."

That reason followed as a matter of course. They all knew that that was correct. Examinations for the degree of Learned Doctor of Laws in universities were as a rule conducted by men who did not hold that degree. He believed that examinations of a lower standard than the one he had just mentioned were also conducted in a similar manner. The sixth reason was—

"Because the chemists of this colony are desirous of abolishing the present unsatisfactory system, and claim that they only wish to substitute a better one for their own credit and the safety of the public."

The chemists of the colony had taken a great deal of trouble in the matter. They had agitated for four or five years for the purpose of introducing a measure providing for a much stricter training and education than was required for many years past under the auspices of the Medical Board. He need scarcely call attention to the disclosures that had been made, showing the laxity that had existed under the present system. Men who had not been qualified had been admitted as chemists and druggists, and they could not say what the consequences had been. Such cases, of course, were few and far between. At any rate, he trusted that there were not many instances of the kind. They had had one instance in the colony—a very unfortunate instance—and the chemists had been so much exercised by it that they had determined to continue the agitation which they had commenced long before that case was disclosed. The occurrence was regarded by them as strong evidence in favour of a measure to prevent gross ignorance and carelessness in the administration of drugs. The last reason given by the Legislative Assembly was:—

"Because the object and intention of the Bill would be practically defeated without the amendments."

That really embodied the whole of the other reasons. It was quite correct; it was a true statement of the case. If the chemists were deprived of the power which it was proposed to confer upon them by the Bill of conducting their own affairs, it was unreasonable to expect them, for a long time at any rate, to put their business and their system of education, admission, and registration on a satisfactory basis. He had just one thing further to say. The message from the Legislative Assembly had been agreed to unanimously. There was no question of division, and there was no opposition to it. The message contained the grounds on which the members of the Assembly had arrived at their decision, and the reasons given were strong reasons why the amendment should not be insisted upon. He did not think he could say anything on the subject—in fact, he might simply have read the reasons and then have asked the Committee to agree to the message of the Legislative Assembly. He moved that the Council do not insist on their disagreement to the amendments of the Legislative Assembly in clause 5, for the reasons given in the message of the Assembly dated the 21st of November.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said that was the fourth or fifth time that question had been discussed. Very decided expressions of opinion had been given by that Chamber in former discussions on the subject, and nothing that had been urged by the Legislative Assembly in its message, or by the Hon. Mr. Thynne in

his remarks that afternoon, had affected his mind upon the subject. The matter was precisely in the same position as when it was last discussed by the Committee. There had been one or two very important admissions, which he thought ought to influence hon. gentlemen if they had any doubt in their minds against assenting to the proposition of the Legislative Assembly. The admissions were that the Bill had been introduced to benefit and regulate the practice of chemists in the colony, and that the necessity for the Bill was that the public were not sufficiently protected at present, and that it was desirable that the opportunity should be afforded of giving that protection to the public which was absolutely necessary. The hon. gentleman had gone through all the reasons stated by the Legislative Assembly in their message, and had given the Committee an additional one—namely, that there appeared to be a unanimous consensus of opinion in the Assembly as to the desirability of insisting upon their amendments. As a matter of fact there was very little interest taken in the discussion of the subject by the Assembly. The Bill appeared to have been championed by a gentleman who was himself an unauthorised practitioner—and not a very successful one.

The HON. J. TAYLOR: Name?

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: The records of the House would show that. He quite agreed with the last reason given by the Assembly—namely, "that the object and intention of the Bill would be practically defeated without the amendment." He quite concurred in the opinion that the object and intention of the framers of the Bill—the persons who put it in motion—those men, who had not the qualifications themselves at present, would be defeated if the amendment of the Council were insisted upon. Those gentlemen were desirous of getting a status accorded to them which their attainments did not authorise them in getting; and in addition to that they wanted to be placed in the position of a board of pharmacy which would have to determine what qualifications future chemists should possess, although they had never proved that they possessed them by undergoing any test whatever. He objected to that entirely. Those persons had not proved themselves qualified to be pharmaceutical chemists by undergoing the ordinary examinations. Then how could they be capable of prescribing what tests should be gone through by future candidates for the profession? Some of the reasons given by the Legislative Assembly were not accurate. He would begin at the top. The first reason was "because, without them, the Government would be limited in their choice of the members of the first pharmacy board to medical men, which would cause that board only to be a repetition of the present Medical Board." That was not true. The Government would not be limited in their choice to medical men for the first board. If they were to believe the evidence, there were chemists in Brisbane who had undergone examinations and received certificates of competency from the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain. Those gentlemen would be eligible for appointment as members of the board.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE: Who are they?

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: He did not know all their names. The hon. gentleman himself had mentioned one—Mr. Yeo. He (the Postmaster-General) believed there was another—that Mr. Johnson, who was practising as a homœopathic chemist in Edward street, was a registered chemist and druggist of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain. He believed there was also a gentleman in George street who had a certificate of competency from a pharmaceutical society which would be recognised by the Bill; and there was also another in Queen street. There were, in fact, four or five gentlemen who held certificates of competency from pharmaceutical societies at home, and all those gentlemen would be eligible to sit on the board under the amendment which was passed by the Council. He believed the chemists were highly respectable tradespeople, but the hon. gentleman himself had admitted that under existing arrangements men not qualified had been registered. And those were the men whom they were going to authorise to sit on the pharmacy board to elect others to sit on the board; and, in fact, to make all future appointments to the board. They had been importing from year to year a large number of chemists from home. The Pharmaceutical Society had been in existence for a great many years, and if the gentlemen now practising as chemists in the colony were qualified there would have been no difficulty in proving their qualifications before the Pharmaceutical Society, if they desired to do so. In the amendment which he introduced in clause 5, he stipulated that any person should be eligible for a seat on the board if he had a certificate from the Pharmaceutical Society at home, or any subsequent society which might be recognised under the Bill, or if he underwent an examination of the prescribed character. Was there any hardship in that? All he wished to secure was that the Bill should get proper administration by competent men, and the usual method of discovering the competency of individuals aspiring to become professional or *quasi* professional men was by the ordeal of a test examination. He did not wish to exclude anyone who was competent from the board; but those gentlemen wanted to step into the position of being eligible for seats on the board without undergoing the ordeal which they wanted everybody to undergo in future. With regard to the Hon. Mr. Thynne's remarks about attorneys, it was quite true that the board for the examination of attorneys delegated to outsiders the conduct of preliminary examinations; but the members of the board were themselves attorneys and barristers who had already undergone test examinations. The third reason was—

"Because the examination of candidates as to the knowledge of the qualities of drugs, and their ability to detect adulterations, can only be safely entrusted to men who have had great experience in the sale and purchase of drugs."

He did not know that the mere fact of selling a drug, no matter for how many years, would make a man competent to detect adulteration; therefore that reason did not bear on the question at all. The next reason was—

"Because of the English Pharmacy Board very few of the members are themselves examiners."

He did not know whether that was so or not; but they knew that the members of the board in Great Britain were pharmaceutical chemists who had undergone examination.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE: No; they have not all passed examination.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said they had. Before they had a statutory status at all at home the chemists formed themselves into a society, an organisation by which no person was entitled to use the designation of pharmaceutical chemist without undergoing an examination; and that organisation had been in existence nine years before the first Act was passed in Great Britain. That Act was amended twelve or thirteen years afterwards in order to make the examination more stringent. He was prepared

to admit the 5th paragraph, but it did not affect the question in the slightest degree. It said :—

"Because it is not unusual in academical bodies that examinations for degrees or diplomas should be in part conducted by persons not themselves holding the degree or diploma."

Even if such were the case, the fact still remained that the board consisted of highly educated men whose competency had been proved. The next reason was—

"Because the chemists of this colony are desirous of abolishing the present unsatisfactory system, and claim that they only wish to substitute a better one, for their own credit and the safety of the public."

And if it had gone on to add "and to dub themselves with a title for which they have no qualification" it would have been correct. The matter had been discussed at such length that it was not worth while to consider it further, except so far as the public were concerned. He objected to allowing persons to arrogate to themselves positions for which their education and professional attainments did not qualify them ; and he therefore moved that all the words after "that" be omitted, with a view of inserting the words "the Chairman leave the chair, report no progress, and ask leave to sit again that day six months."

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said the Postmaster-General had mentioned the name of one chemist as holding the qualification required by the Bill—Mr. Yeo. He only wished to say that that gentleman was the most active of the chemists in advocating the Bill and getting it passed through Parliament. Mr. Yeo was convinced of the necessity for having the *personnel* as extended as possible.

The HON. P. MACPHERSON said that, as a member of the committee who inquired into the matter, he should like to say a few words before the motion was decided. When the committee commenced its sittings he was against the chemists, because he considered that there was not sufficient material in the city to form a competent board, and he directed his examination in the first instance to prove that such was the case. On the 13th October, 1882, he asked Dr. Bancroft, the president of the Medical Board—

"Do you think the chemists of the colony are fit men to examine under the provisions of this Bill?"

And Dr. Bancroft replied—

"Well, they are, I consider, ill informed, and ill able to carry it out. They have very little scientific knowledge of either drugs or chemicals. The majority of them are merely traders."

In the course of a subsequent examination on the 28th July, 1884, Dr. Bancroft was asked by the Hon. Mr. Thynne—

"I will ask you, doctor,—going through the list of the principal chemists in practice in Brisbane seriatim,—do you not think there will be a sufficient number of competent men found amongst them to form, with the medical practitioners, a good board?"

And he replied—

"I think the medical men would be able to select a very fair number of pharmacy men, if they had the power, to constitute such a board."

That was the very gentleman who in 1882 said the chemists of the colony were not fit to carry out the provisions of the Bill; and if the president of the Medical Board could alter his opinion in 18 months, he (Hon. Mr. Macpherson) could alter his also. The true secret of the position of the medical men and the chemists in regard to their status was to be seen from some more evidence given by Dr. Bancroft on the last-mentioned date. That gentleman let the cat out of the bag in giving the following evidence :—

"That is really the difficulty you have to contend with? Well, you see, the chemists get the prescriptions of medical men, and they then have the patients very often in their hands ; and there being no law to prevent chemists acting as doctors, the medical men, by giving prescriptions, are playing into the chemists' hands.

"They simply increase the price of medicine dispensed under the prescriptions; they do not charge for advice to or attendance on the patient? Yes."

That was the true secret of the position. He believed from what he had seen that there were chemists and druggists, even in Queen street, as capable of dispensing as some of the medical men, and he believed the time had arrived when those gentlemen should have a chance of starting a society of their own. The public would benefit by it ; and on that ground he cordially supported the motion.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said he was sorry the hon. gentleman had spoken in such a manner of the medical men. He believed the opinion of those gentlemen had not been biassed in the slightest degree, and it was the opinion of competent men, whose competency had been proved by test examinations, and who held diplomas. He had known instances in which chemists had interfered with the prescriptions of medical men. They all knew the proverb, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." Some chemists thought that because they had read a few prescriptions they knew more than men who had studied medicine all their lives ; and the more ignorant they were the greater responsibility they were willing to undertake. Many would even undertake surgical operations as well as make up prescriptions of their own. The whole question had been fully discussed, and the unanimous consensus of opinion arrived at by persons competent to judge was, that the chemists as a body were not fit to undertake the responsibilities connected with the status they wished to confer on themselves by the Bill.

The HON. G. KING said he had been informed that there were no chemists or druggists in Brisbane who held diplomas from the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, and he had been likewise told that on the initiation of that society in England many years ago they laboured under the same disadvantage as the chemists in the colony did now. As the appointment of the first board would rest with the Government, and as no doubt they would appoint competent medical men, he thought there could be no very great injury inflicted—no harm could accrue—if one or two of the chemists and druggists of Brisbane were appointed to assist them—men who possessed a perfect knowledge of the qualities of drugs, who were able to detect adulteration, and who had experience in the handling of drugs and their effect. This class of study was below that of medical practitioners, who soared into much higher branches ; but in course of time they would have superior material to select from among the chemists. This was a beginning, and the same disadvantages existed when the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain was called into being.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the hon. gentleman was wrong with regard to the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain. That society was not recognised until it had been in existence a number of years. In that case a number of gentlemen voluntarily formed themselves into a society to establish regulations and hold examinations upon which certificates of competency were issued. That was his strong point. If the chemists and druggists of the colony had voluntarily formed themselves into an association, prescribed rules, and showed that

none but qualified men had got certificates, then it would be fair enough for them to apply to Parliament and ask to be recognised. But they wanted to step into the position at once, and that was what he objected to. Hon. gentlemen had overlooked the fact that the first board would only hold office until the 31st December, 1886. In the meantime very few persons would be able to have undergone the required training. Under the Bill they were required to serve three or five years' apprenticeship before they could be at liberty to be examined.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said it struck him that it would be a great pity indeed to exclude chemists from the board. They were well fitted for the work, and he should be very sorry indeed to see the Bill thrown out. He entirely agreed with the remarks of the Hon. Mr. King, and he trusted that the measure would not be thrown out.

The HON. W. FORREST said he had not much to say upon the question, which was one upon which he was very ignorant; but the way the matter presented itself to his mind, from listening to the arguments that had been used and looking through the Bill, was this: They had at present a number of chemists and druggists in the colony who were under no restraint wherever; and, however imperfect the Bill might be, it would impose some restrictions upon the indiscriminate vending of medicines, many of which were active poisons. It was certainly better to have a Bill that would effect that, even if it were not altogether perfect, than to have none at all. Coming to what the hon. the Postmaster-General had stated respecting the Pharmaceutical Society in England, and how it had got its status, it appeared that a certain number of persons there were in exactly the same position as the chemists and druggists here. At a period antecedent to the registration of the society, a number of chemists and druggists formed themselves into a society and examined each other. What better were they, or in what way were they more enlightened, after that examination than they were before it? It was simply a matter of—"You claw my back, and I'll claw yours; now we are a body of men who have gone through the most perfect examination. We may have been ignorant when we started, but this has enlightened us, and we will now call ourselves the Pharmaceutical Society, get ourselves registered, and have a recognised status." It appeared to him that they were not one bit better after the examination than before it. Judging by the clause, he presumed that the chemists and druggists of Brisbane were registered for dispensing medicines]; and, being registered, it was only a reasonable presumption that they knew something about the business, and therefore would be able to examine other chemists. If they were not competent to conduct the business why were they registered? There was not the slightest doubt that if the Bill were passed it would do something to protect the public against incompetent men dispensing powerful medicines, the nature of which they were, perhaps, utterly ignorant of.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said when the matter in question was before the Committee previously he voted against the amendment, and gave reasons why he considered that it was not desirable to introduce it. He did not think it necessary to recapitulate what he said on that occasion; but he must say that he was decidedly of opinion that a very large number of their present chemists were just as competent to understand pharmaceutical chemistry and the dispensation of drugs—which was totally distinct from analytical chemistry—as any medical practitioner. That statement in no way reflected upon medical practitioners, because they were working in a higher sphere, and consequently were not even as well acquainted with the details of the discrimination of drugs—as to their precise form and appearance—as practical chemists, even though they might not hold a formal certificate of the Pharmaceutical Society. Another thing was that the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain was constituted very much in the same way as this body was proposed to be constituted. They were originally uncertified men, and a number of them got together and said "We will form ourselves into a society," and afterwards they got an Act passed to incorporate their society. Here the chemists had been incorporated together under a law—they had been registered as practising chemists and placed on a list, which was under some sort of supervision by the medical practitioners—under the Medical Board; and therefore the proposal to constitute the new board, in part, from amongst those chemists could not, as far as he could see, involve any sort of risk to the public, while at the same time it would be doing a fair amount of justice to the chemists already in practice. For the first two years — until the end of 1886—the board would be constituted by the Governor, of course with the advice of the Executive Council; and they could very easily leave out the chemists and put none but medical practitioners on the board, if they thought that course was advisable in the interests of the public. Under the circumstances, he thought it was far better that they should not insist upon their amendment, and thereby widen the field from which the board could be selected.

Question—That the Committee do not insist upon their disagreement to the amendment of the Legislative Assembly in clause 5—put and passed.

On the motion of the HON. A. J. THYNNE, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, and reported the resolution. The report was adopted, and the Bill ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Assembly by message in the usual form.

JURY BILL.

The PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received the following message from the Legislative Assembly:—

"MR. PRESIDENT.

"The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's amendments in the Jury Bill, disagree to the amendment in clause 3. Because by the existing law a jury *de ventre inspiciendo* is required to be empannelled in the cases mentioned in the said clause, and it is desirable that this law should be repealed expressly and not by uncertain implication; and agree to the other amendments in the Bill.

"WILLIAM H. GROOM,
"Speaker."

On the motion of the HON. A. J. THYNNE, the consideration of the Legislative Assembly's message in committee was made an Order of the Day for next sitting day.

DIVISIONAL BOARDS AGRICULTURAL DRAINAGE BILL—COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the HON. A. J. THYNNE, the President left the chair, and the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider this Bill in detail.

The several clauses of the Bill, and the preamble, were passed as printed.

On the motion of the HON. A. J. THYNNE, the House resumed, the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment; the report was adopted, and the third reading made an Order of the Day for the next sitting day.

MARYBOROUGH AND URANGAN RAILWAY BILL—COMMITTEE.

On motion of the HON. P. MACPHERSON, the President left the chair, and the House went into Committee to consider this Bill in detail.

On clause 1—"Interpretation"—

The HON. P. MACPHERSON said: Before the clause was put he wished, in justice to himself, to make a remark in answer to what had fallen from the Hon. Mr. Walsh on the second reading of the Bill. That hon. gentleman had expressed a doubt as to the existence of the company who were the promoters of the line. He had been to a certain extent answered by the Hon. Mr. Taylor, but as he (Hon. Mr. Macpherson) could not have anticipated that the Hon. Mr. Walsh would have made the remarks he did, he had no previous opportunity of answering them. He might say that he now held in his hand a copy of the articles of the company, and it was stated there that one of the objects for which the company was formed was—

"To survey, form, make, construct, maintain, repair, manage, and work certain lines of railway in the Wide Bay district, in the colony of Queensland, between Maryborough and Croydon, and between a point on the Maryborough and Burrum Railway line about miles from Maryborough aforesaid and Urangan, together with all convenient branches and appliances."

And also—

"To obtain any Act of Parliament for enabling the company to carry out any of its objects, or to obtain any rights, powers, or privileges; and to submit and agree to any restrictions, qualifications, or conditions, that Parliament may impose."

He might also say that some of the shareholders of the company were very influential capitalists in Melbourne; and he was certain the House knew sufficient of him to admit that he would not be a stalking-horse to introduce a sham scheme for a bogus company. He wished to move as an amendment upon the clause the insertion of the following additional paragraph after the 3rd paragraph of the clause:—

The expression "railway wharf" means the main wharf or wharves to be constructed at Urangan at the termination of the railway.

That was in order to meet the objection raised by his hon. friend Mr. Gregory, and would compel the company to sell the wharf at Urangan to the Government, as well as the railway works. He had previously supposed himself that it would be considered as part of the railway works.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said that since the Bill was under consideration last, and in view of the objection raised by the Hon. Mr. Gregory that no provision was made for the purchase of the wharf at the end of the line, and after an examination of the anchorage there, the matter had been looked into by the members of the Government, and it had been considered desirable that the Government should have the same right of purchasing the wharf as they were to have of purchasing the railway. Certain other amendments had been suggested on consideration of the Bill, and he understood that they were in the hands of the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, and that he would move them. The amendment just moved was the more important one, and was inserted in order to provide that the railway wharf at the end of the line should be one of the articles purchased by the Government. He had thought that the word "undertaking" covered the matter; but that word was so comprehensive that it would embrace property which the Government might not desire to have the right to purchase, and which perhaps they ought not to have the right to purchase.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said that in alling attention on the second reading of the Bill to what he considered certain omissions in the Bill, the one just alluded to by the Postmaster-General was the leading one of which he spoke. It was provided that the Government might purchase the railway, but no provision was made for purchasing the wharf at the end of it. He might also say he approved of the amendment proposed, because he thought they should not include all the works that might probably come under the head of "the undertaking." There were some minor matters in the latter part of the Bill to which he also took exception on the second reading. He had made inquiries, and he now understood that amendments would be moved by the hon. member in charge of the Bill, to meet all the objections he had raised in speaking on the second reading of the Bill.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 9, inclusive, passed as printed.

On clause 10, as follows:—

"Particulars of all expenditure upon the railway, with proper vouchers, shall from time to time be submitted by the company to the engineer."

The HON. P. MACPHERSON moved that the words "and railway wharves" be inserted after the word "railway" in the 1st line.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 11, as follows:—

"The company shall be entitled to take, use, occupy, and purchase, at a price per acre to be agreed upon between the Minister and the company, so much Crown lands as are necessary for the proper construction of the undertaking and working of the line, and the erection of stations, with usual buildings, turnouts, and other appliances ordinarily required in the maintenance and management of railways. Provided, if the Minister and the company are unable to agree upon the price, the same shall be decided by arbitration, but this section shall not authorise the purchase by the company of any land vested in or occupied by the Commissioner for Railways."

The HON. P. MACPHERSON moved that the following words be added at the end of the clause:—

Provided, however, that it shall be lawful for the Commissioner for Railways to lease or grant to the company a license to use and occupy, on such terms and conditions as the Minister shall think reasonable, any such land so vested in the Commissioner for Railways as shall be required for the purposes of the company.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 12 to 27, inclusive, passed as printed.

On clause 28, as follows:—

"If at any time after the completion of the railway the company shall desire to use, in conjunction with the Government, that portion of the Government railway line between Croydon and the junction of the company's railway with the Maryborough and Burrum railway line for the purpose of connecting the traffic of the company's lines, the Minister shall afford to the company all reasonable facilities for using the aforesaid portion of the Government railway line and for running thereon with their engines, carriages, trucks, and wagons for the ordinary purposes or business of the company, subject to such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Minister and the company for the safety and protection of the interests of the public."

The HON. P. MACPHERSON moved that the words "first section of the main line of" be inserted before the word "railway" in the 1st line, and the words "as far as the fifteen-mile peg in portion 37 of the parish of Urangan" after the word "railway" in the same line.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 29 to 56, inclusive, passed as printed.

On motion of the HON. P. MACPHERSON, clause 57 was amended so as to read as follows:—

"At any time after the expiration of five years from the final completion of the railway and railway wharf, the Governor in Council may purchase from the company the railway and railway wharf with the rolling-stock and all appurtenances thereof at a sum equal to the cost price of the said railway with five pounds per annum calculated from the date of such final completion for every one hundred pounds of the said cost price added thereto, together with a sum equal to the then value of the said rolling-stock, appurtenances, and railway wharf. The amount of such purchase money shall be certified to by the engineer before the same shall be paid to the company: but if any dispute or difference shall arise between the company and the engineer or the Minister as to the sum to be inserted in the engineer's certificate, or as to the said purchase money, the same shall be determined by arbitration."

Clauses 58 to 80, inclusive, passed as printed.

On clause 81, as follows:—

"If the main line of railway referred to in the deposited plans, sections, and books of reference is not completed within three years from the passing of this Act, then, on the expiration of that period, the powers, rights, and privileges by this Act granted to the company for acquiring land by purchase or otherwise and for working and completing the railway, or otherwise in relation thereto, shall cease and determine, and thereupon the sum deposited by the company to the credit of the Minister as aforesaid as security for the due completion of the main line of railway shall be and become absolutely forfeited to Her Majesty."

The HON. P. MACPHERSON moved the insertion of the words "and railway wharf" after the word "railway" in line 36.

The HON. W. APLIN asked whether the railway wharf was referred to in the deposited plans, sections, and books of reference mentioned in the clause?

The HON. P. MACPHERSON said it was not. He moved the omission of the word "is" in the 37th line, with the view of inserting the words "and railway wharf are."

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Preamble put and passed.

On motion of the HON. P. MACPHERSON, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, and reported the Bill to the House with amendments.

The report was adopted, and the third reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for the next sitting day of the House.

CROWN LANDS BILL—COMMITTEE.

Upon the Order of the Day being read for the further consideration of this Bill in committee, the President left the chair, and the House went into Committee.

On clause 75, as follows:—

"The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the board, may by proclamation declare any country lands which are entirely or extensively overgrown by scrub of the kinds known as brigalow, gidya, mallee, sandalwood, bendee, oak, and wattle, or any of them, to be scrub lands for the purposes of this Act, and thereupon the same may be dealt with in the manner prescribed in this part of this Act."

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said in this and the two following clauses under the head of "scrub lands" they found provision made whereby persons could go into the scrubs of the colony, establish themselves, and remain there for several years, paying practically no rent. Although after the first year the selector of those lands was supposed to begin clearing and cutting down the scrub, it was quite clear that as a practical matter he would during that time establish himself, and after that it would be a system of evasion. During another year he would simply devote his time to getting all the cattle out of the scrub that were unbranded and put his own brand upon them; and he, very likely, would not be very particular as to his brand getting on something else. There was no guarantee of *bonâ fides*, such as they would have in the case of a lease, where the selector had to pay rent. Then again they found by clause 76 that first-class scrub land was to have only one-third of scrub upon it. Now, they knew perfectly well that a very large proportion of first-class runs had got more than one-third of their area covered with scrub; and yet, after imposing certain restrictions and charging special rents in some cases, they were, in those instances, letting a man go and take up a block of 20,000 acres of land without having any rent to pay for so many years. Why should they do that, when the same class of country would be valued, very likely, considerably over the minimum rent as a grazing farm? He thought it was really a very dangerous matter to allow the proposed system of scrub leases. No doubt those who framed the provision were under the impression that if they cleared away scrub they thereby improved the capabilities of the country for carrying stock. But what had happened within the last few months? Thousands and thousands of cattle would have been utterly annihilated had it not been for the scrubs on which they had had to live. Having no grass, their only means of living had been the scrubs. Only the other day he had a letter placed before him, in which a person who was travelling through the Burnett district said—he was not referring to the Land Bill in any way—that if it had not been for the scrubs the whole of his cattle would have been lost. Not only was it a doubtful matter whether the clearing of scrub was of any use at all to the country, or the very reverse of an advantage; but they were asked to allow people to establish themselves in those localities where they would be practically levying blackmail, or rather committing robbery, upon the *bonâ fide* occupants of the country round about—not only the pastoral lessees, upon whom the Government seemed to have such an unreasonable "down," but also against those who held grazing farms. Under those conditions he really failed to see what advantage was to arise from Part V. as applied to leases of scrub land.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said he most distinctly denied that the Government had got any "down," reasonable or unreasonable, against the pastoral tenants. He had said so over and over again, and now repeated it; and he did not know why the accusation should have been introduced in that part of the Bill. He had not the vast, extensive experience of the Hon. Mr. Gregory, who seemed to have a perfectly accurate knowledge of every mortal thing under the sun; and so he was not prepared to hazard an opinion with regard to the utilisation of scrub lands, or whether it was more advantageous for grazing stock to have a run covered with scrub or not. The clauses in question were introduced in the honest belief that the scrubs referred to could be made useful for grazing purposes. They were practically useless at present. The provisions of clause 75 would not apply to any part of a holding, and there was no bar against the lessee of a holding taking up those scrub lands. As to the possibility of cattle-duffing, to which the hon. gentleman had referred, provision was made that in the first instance, before the land should be open to selection for the purposes mentioned, the board must put the Government in motion, and a proclamation must be issued; and a further proof of the *bonâ fide* intention of the party concerned was required in a subsequent provision of the part, to the effect that a certain amount of fencing must be

constructed every year, otherwise the license would be forfeited. It was unquestionably an experiment — an experiment with the view of utilising, as far as practicable, country that was unavailable at the present time. As he had said, he had no personal experience in the matter, but when the idea was started it proved attractive to him, and he had heard nothing since to satisfy him that the experiment was not worth trying. However, if hon. gentlemen—who had a vast deal more experience in the matter than he had—had made up their minds that the experiment was not worth trying it would not affect him, and it would not affect the Government. He said the experiment would not be tried if the majority of the members of the Committee made up their minds that it should not.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said he was satisfied the Postmaster-General believed he was legislating for the good of the country. No doubt some day the scrub lands would be utilised and probably cleared, but the question was whether it should be done at present. What the Hon. Mr. Gregory had stated was a fact—if it had not been for scrubs of that sort upon runs, stock would often have died, because they had nothing else to live upon in many cases. Those who were acquainted with the matter knew that where there were brigalow scrubs the cattle stopped in them and almost lived entirely upon the scrub. He supposed that anyone taking up a scrub farm would be likely to take up a place where there was grass also, such as was described in the "first class" in clause 76. There would be an inducement to persons to go into those farms for nefarious purposes, and it would be advisable for the present at all events to omit that part of the Bill entirely. It would in no way hurt the Bill or harm the country to do so. If grazing farms were found to succeed—and if anything under the Bill would succeed he believed it would be the grazing farms—it would be time enough then to introduce such clauses as were contained in Part V. At present, if anyone had a fancy for scrub land, there was nothing to prevent them taking it up at ¼d. an acre. He thought any practical person taking up 20,000 acres would be glad to take up some scrub with his holding. He believed much of the scrub land would be taken up in that way. Just as many persons taking up freeholds were glad to have mountainous country in their holdings for winter runs. The omission of Part V. would, in his opinion, be desirable for the present.

The HON. G. KING said he did not for one moment question the intentions of the Government in introducing those clauses, but he thought the experiment was not worth trying. Perhaps, if it involved a question of revenue, he might take a different view of the matter; but as for ten or fifteen years the Treasury would derive no benefit from the operation of these clauses, he thought the risk of leaving it open to anyone to take up scrub lands for nothing at all was too great; it might lead persons to enter upon the occupation of those lands for purposes which had better not be indulged in. On the whole, he thought it advisable to eliminate the clauses.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said he agreed with the hon. gentleman who had last spoken. There was great danger that men would take up scrub lands, and do a great deal of mischief to pastoral lessees outside. They often found water in the scrubs, and a man might take up a farm or selection inside the scrub around the water, and go in for stealing stock from all the persons around him. That was one reason why he objected to the clauses, and it should also be remembered that after those men had done all the mischief they could possibly do, and could steal no more stock, they would probably throw up the selection. He recollected perfectly well that when he was Minister for Lands, many years ago, the same thing took place in connection with the cedar and pine scrubs. They were thrown open at a merely nominal rent, and when every foot of good timber was taken out of them, the parties threw up the selections they had applied for. The same thing would be done over again. He had no doubt that that part of the Bill was *bonâ fide* brought forward by the Government as an experiment; but as the Postmaster-General had said the Government did not care particularly about the clauses he thought the best thing they could do would be to omit them.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I should like to have the experiment tried myself.

Clause put and negatived.

Clauses 76 to 79, inclusive, put and negatived.

Clauses 80 and 81 passed as printed.

On clause 82, as follows:—

"All such lands shall be distinguished as town or suburban lots, according to their respective positions, and shall be offered as nearly as may be in areas according to the following scale:—

Town lands in allotments of from one rood to one acre;

Suburban lands within one mile from town lands in lots of from one acre to five acres;

Suburban lands over one mile from town lands in lots of from one acre to ten acres."

The HON. J. C. HEUSSLER said that in the Bill it appeared the Government deprived themselves of selling country lands by auction altogether; and for his own part he would like to see the alienation system tried in respect to country lands side by side with the leasing principle. However, it struck him that some slight alteration was necessary in clause 82. It provided that suburban lands over one mile from town lands should only be sold in lots of from one to ten acres, and he thought the area was too small. He believed that persons living near towns would like to have paddocks in which to establish orchards, vineyards, or market gardens, and if such was their desire the area they would be allowed to purchase was too small.

The HON. SIR A. H. PALMER: If the lots are too small they can buy two or three.

The HON. J. C. HEUSSLER said that was good enough, but he still thought the area allowed was too small. Men could buy two or three lots certainly, but hon. gentlemen knew perfectly well what a difficult matter it would be to get them contiguous. They might get any number of lots, but the difficulty would be to get them in one block. He begged to move as an amendment that in the last line of the clause the word "ten" should be omitted, with the view of inserting the word "forty."

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said if a person wished to secure forty acres in a suburban district there was no bar against his doing so as the clause now stood, but under the Hon. Mr. Heussler's scheme the man with the biggest pocket would be able to drive out all persons who wished to secure lots offered for sale occasionally in suburban districts. He thought ten acres was a very fair-sized lot to offer at auction at one time. There was really not much principle involved in the matter, but on the principle that every man should have a chance to compete for land offered at auction it was very desirable to limit the lots to small areas.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said the Hon. Mr. Heussler's argument was undoubtedly sound. What could a man do with ten acres of land two miles from town?

The HON. SIR A. H. PALMER: Cut it up.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said he could cut it up, of course, but that was not the intention of the Bill. It was all very well for hon. gentlemen to say that a man could buy two or three lots, but he could do nothing of the sort. If the Postmaster-General, for instance, went into an auction-room and purchased one or two lots, and wished to secure the adjoining lots, he would not be able to do so, for Mr. Somebody over the way would oppose him, and say, "No, he is a radical; I will not let him have it." He maintained that 10 acres, two miles from town, was no earthly good to any man.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said the speeches which had been made on that subject showed which way the wind blew.

The HON. J. TAYLOR: What do you mean?

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR: The hon. gentleman would see directly. The Hon. Mr. Heussler, who had been such a staunch supporter of the Bill, found——

The HON. J. C. HEUSSLER: I am not a staunch supporter of the Bill. I am an independent member——

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order!

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said he was very glad to find that the hon. gentleman agreed with him, and that he was not a staunch supporter of the Bill. He (Hon. Mr. Murray-Prior) thought 40 acres near the town was not sufficient for a man. As the Hon. Mr. Heussler very properly observed, a man might want a vineyard or a paddock near his house. He (Hon. Mr. Murray-Prior) was aware that extending the area from 10 to 40 acres did not interfere with the principle of the Bill, but the proposal only showed that the desire to obtain a freehold was inherent in mankind. As he had before said, before very long the staunchest supporters of the Government would loudly call out for freeholds, freeholds, freeholds! All would want a freehold, whether it was two miles from town or a greater distance. Freeholds they would have, whatever that Bill might say to the contrary.

The HON. W. APLIN said he thought the main object of the Bill was to do away with the alienation of Crown lands, but he found that that principle was not applied to town and suburban lands. Why should they not apply the principle of leasing to town lands as well as country lands? They found the residents of towns were strong advocates for the sale of town and suburban lands, and were not satisfied with lots of 10 acres, but wanted the area extended to 40 acres. He would like to see the principle of non-alienation applied to town lands as well as country lands. He would oppose the amendment.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said he could scarcely support the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Heussler, because, although he certainly would not object very much to larger pieces of land being sold at auction, still they had a Bill before them which they had been working at and amending with the object of making it consistent throughout—whether they had succeeded or not was another matter—and it would be inconsistent to make provision that country lands should be sold under the guise of suburban lands, or in other words, to try and sell country lands under another designation. If the Bill provided that 80 acres should be the maximum, he should not have any objection to it; but when they found that a very large number of individuals, who were interested in town and suburban lands, and whose business for many years past had been to a great extent directed to the unearned increment—perhaps that was the expression to use—had considered that it would be better for the community and themselves, who also formed a part of the community, that it should be only 10 acres and not 80, why should they alter it? Then again, as regarded the quantity of land, it was stated that a person who wanted 40 acres might not be able to get it in consecutive blocks. No doubt that was the difficulty in the auction mode of sale. But under clause 90 they found that the Government could do what was called "placing goods in a line," that was leaving the lands open to purchase without competition, at the upset price after auction, and no doubt the Government would adopt that plan, so that persons who wanted 20, 30, or 40 acres of land could take up conterminous blocks, without being liable to a system of competition. They knew that one of the general plans which had been adopted at auction sales was not to bid for the lands, but to let them be passed in, not for the purpose of defrauding the revenue, but to enable the parties to secure the consecutive pieces they required without running the risk they would do if they bought one lot, and had to compete for the next with somebody else who only wanted to get the land in order that he might be bought off. Taking the clause as a whole, he thought it far better to let it remain in its present shape.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said he did not see that the hon. gentleman's argument had the slightest weight. The hon. gentleman stated that conterminous blocks could be bought without competition after auction; but if they were sold in the meantime, what was a man to do? He contended that 10 acres of land, two miles from town, was of no use to anyone.

The HON. J. F. McDOUGALL said the whole principle of the Bill was that of leasing the Crown lands, and he saw no reason why it should be departed from in that case. However he was not going to oppose the clause, but he would certainly oppose the amendment. They had steadily kept the small man in view throughout the passage of the Bill. The amendments made by the Council were entirely in favour of the small holder, and he saw no reason why they should not continue on that principle. But if they increased the area of suburban lots to 40 acres, as proposed by the Hon. Mr. Heussler, they would prevent the small capitalist from successfully competing with the larger capitalist. He would vote against the amendment.

The HON. W. FORREST said he thought that, on the score of consistency, they ought to strike out that clause altogether. He could not help expressing his astonishment that hon. members should oppose either the auction system, or the increase of the area of suburban lots as proposed by the Hon. Mr. Heussler. He would give some reasons for this. It had been asserted and re-asserted that people who had taken up country lands, who had bought them and paid for them—those land cormorants, as they were called—had done nothing for the country. It was said that those men had actually taken up land and done nothing for the country. Hon. members had heard that day after day, and night after night. Well, if they had done nothing for the country, the country had advanced. Therefore somebody must have done something. If it was not the owners of country lands it must be the owners of town lands, and why deprive the country of that means of progress? The corner allotment syndicates were the people who were doing good to the country, if the statements they had so often heard were correct. Within ten miles of Brisbane they were cutting up land into 16-perch allotments. The Hon. Mr. Heussler, and those

who agreed with him, held that it was downright immoral and dishonest to sell country lands. But why should not those men who really added nothing to the wealth of the country by gambling in corner allotments be deprived of the opportunity of gambling in that way? He hoped hon. gentlemen who were going to vote for the increase of the area to 40 acres would think the matter over very carefully before doing so.

The HON. J. C. HEUSSLER said he must explain himself after the very full discussion there had been on the amendment. If his proposal were carried, the size of the allotments need not always be fixed at 40 acres. His amendment was simply to make that the maximum area. The Government could make the allotments as small as they liked. The clause provided that the area of town allotments should be from 1 rood to 1 acre, of suburban lots, within one mile from town, from 1 to 5 acres, and of suburban lots over one mile from town lands, from 1 acre to 10 acres. There was no mention in the clause of suburban lands two miles from town, and, therefore, they might be ten miles distant.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE: If you look at the interpretation clause you will find that suburban lands are Crown lands within a distance of two miles from town lands.

The HON. J. C. HEUSSLER said they would see that by-and-by. A good deal had been said about leasing; but it was not necessary to force leases on people. Of course they could select 40 acres under the leasing clauses, but if people wanted land in the neighbourhood of towns for vineyards, gardens, or grazing paddocks it should be optional whether they would have freehold or leasehold.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said that was an appropriate occasion on which to refer to the bad tendency the Bill would have with regard to the burdens on the two classes of people. The theory of the Government was that they would obtain such a revenue from country lands as would enable them to pay for the money they borrowed, and to a certain extent for the working of the colony. They were throwing on the country people the expense of maintaining the colony in its existence, and relieving entirely the people in the towns and their immediate suburbs. In the towns, in proportion to their population, there was rather a small amount of productive industry; but it was not so in the country; and if one had time to work it out from the statistics of the colony, he would find that a very small proportion of the male adult population engaged in production. It was on the productions of the colony that the people lived; and working the calculation out further they would find that for every person engaged in the country districts in production there were ten people producing nothing, but living on the labour of one man. He had not had time to go into the details with regard to Queensland, but he had the privilege recently of meeting a gentleman who had worked them out with regard to New South Wales, and he calculated that in that colony there were only 150,000 men engaged in productive industries, while the remainder of the population were actually living one upon the other, and upon the labours of these 150,000 people. And the tendency of the Bill would be to aggravate that sort of thing in Queensland.

The HON. J. TAYLOR: What have you to say about the clause? You have said nothing about that.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he was not in favour of the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived, and clause put and passed.

Clauses 83 to 93, inclusive, passed as printed.

On clause 94, as follows:—

"Upon application made within twelve months after the proclamation in the *Gazette* of the first sale of any town land situated within any new city, town, village, or reserve, upon which improvements are situated, the Governor in Council may sell and grant the allotment or allotments containing such improvements to the owner of such improvements without competition at the fair value thereof in an unimproved state, not being less than twice the minimum upset price as defined by this Act."

The HON. W. FORREST said he only rose to say he was very glad to see that the Government had so tenderly guarded the pre-emptive right of a man who put up improvements on a township reserve. But he failed to see on what principle they gave a pre-emptive selection to a man because he was close to the town, and tried to refuse it to the pastoral lessee who had a legal right to it. He supposed it was on the principle that if a man was near a town it was presumed that he could influence a number of votes—which were necessary to get into Parliament.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 95 to 98, inclusive, passed as printed.

On clause 99, as follows:—

"The Governor in Council may, by proclamation, and without issuing any deed of grant, place any lands reserved, either temporarily or permanently for any such purpose, under the control of trustees; and may, by like proclamation, declare the style or title of such trustees and the trusts of any land placed under their control, and may empower them to make by-laws for carrying out the objects of the trust."

The HON. A. J. THYNNE suggested the addition of a few words to the clause to enable the trustees of public lands to impose a penalty for a breach of their by-laws. He happened to be a trustee of one of the public parks of Brisbane; and though the trustees had power to make by-laws, there was nothing under the trust deed to enable them to impose penalties for the breach of those by-laws.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL moved the addition of the following words to the clause—"and imposing penalties not to exceed £20 for any breach thereof." That amendment would, he thought, meet the objection. It was generally assumed that a body authorised to make by-laws regulating any public matter could also enforce penalties; but doubts had arisen, and perhaps the insertion of those words would put the question beyond doubt.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 100, 101, and 102 passed as printed.

On clause 103, as follows:—

"The Governor in Council may make regulations for the management of any existing common and for giving effect to commonage rights, subject, however, to the following conditions:

That commonage rights shall appertain solely to residents in the township or district for which the common was proclaimed;

That the depasturing of sheep and entire male animals exceeding six months old, except under special conditions, shall be prohibited;

That payment be made for the depasturing of cattle at a rate not less than two shillings per head per annum, and that in no case shall any one person be allowed to run more than twenty head on the same common.

"But nothing herein contained shall prevent *bonâ fide* travellers from depasturing their bullocks, horses, or other stock on any common. Provided that no person travelling with stock shall be deemed a *bonâ fide* traveller, unless such stock are driven towards their destination at least six miles within every successive period of twenty-four hours, unless prevented by rain or flood."

The HON. J. TAYLOR asked whether the clause applied to anything except commons in the outside districts? He understood that it would not apply to commons in the inside districts.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said it would apply to all commons. The previous clause gave power to the Governor in Council to resume commons, and the clause under discussion enabled them to make provision for the management of existing commons—for giving effect to commonage rights; but there was nothing in the Bill authorising the Government to proclaim commons in the future. No commons could be created hereafter; the only power conferred was to enable the Government to deal with commons as they now stood. They could resume them, or if they did not resume them they could make regulations with regard to the use of them. The next clause enabled them to put commons under the control of the municipal council of the district.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 104 to 112 passed as printed.

On clause 113, as follows:—

"It shall not be lawful for a lessee under Part III. of this Act, or for a lessee of a grazing farm under Part IV. of this Act, to cut down or destroy, except for the purposes of his holding, any trees upon the holding without the permission of the commissioner, or to ringbark any trees upon the holding without the like permission.

"A lessee desiring such permission shall apply for it in writing in the prescribed form, specifying the portion of the holding in respect of which he desires the permission. The commissioner shall thereupon inquire into the matter, and may refuse such permission or may grant it upon such conditions as may be prescribed, or, if no conditions are prescribed, as he thinks fit.

"Any such lessee who cuts down or destroys any tree upon his holding, except for the purposes of the holding, without the permission of the commissioner, or contrary to the conditions of the permission, or who ringbarks any tree upon the holding without the like permission, or contrary to the conditions thereof, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than one shilling and not more than ten shillings for every tree so cut down, destroyed, or ringbarked."

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said, although the clause appeared to be rather an arbitrary one, it was necessary under the peculiar conditions of the Bill, in order that what had been a very great malpractice hitherto—that was, persons taking up selections or leases simply for the purposes of cutting the timber, and then forfeiting the land—should be put a stop to. He presumed that that was the object of it.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: That is the object.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY: Under those conditions he thought the clause a reasonable one; and although it might be made very stringent, he could not conceive a Government ever exercising its power so as to be at all oppressive, but only to protect the public estate from being denuded of timber under colour of a license for grazing.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said he would add to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Gregory that, under a previous provision, ringbarking was made an improvement for the benefit of the pastoral lessee or grazing lessee; and the clause contained a stipulation that ringbarking should only be carried out by permission of the commissioner.

The HON. W. FORREST said the clause was a very necessary one. He presumed that regulations would be made under which the commissioner would know exactly what his duties were; and he (Hon. Mr. Forrest) rose to make a suggestion. Whenever he had let contracts for ringbarking he had always made a stipulation that all good timber trees for sawing or shade purposes, or any straight sapling that was likely to grow into a good timber or shade tree, should not be ringbarked; and he thought it would be a very good thing if a provision of that kind was made in the regulations.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said, on reading the clause over carefully, he thought it would be well to make some provision that the prosecution referred to should not be initiated except by the commissioner or some Government official. He could quite imagine that in places where neighbours were in the habit of quarrelling, persons of a litigious spirit could avail themselves of the clause for the punishment and harassment of their neighbours. He therefore moved that after "shall" in the last paragraph, the words "upon the information of the commissioner or other prescribed officer" be inserted.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 114 to 119 passed as printed.

On clause 120, as follows:—

"The provisions of the Fencing Act of 1861 shall apply to all lands included in any lease made under this Act, and the lessee shall be deemed the owner thereof for the purposes of the said Act; and the granting of a lease under this Act shall for the purposes of the said Act be deemed an alienation of such land."

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said the clause did not include land held under license under Part IV. of the Bill—grazing and agricultural farms—up to the time the lease was issued. He therefore moved that in the 2nd line of the clause the words "lease made under this Act" be omitted, with the view of inserting "license under Part IV. of this Act or any holding." His reason for moving the amendment was that, until such time as the lease could be issued for the grazing and agricultural farm—it might be three, four, or five years—the parties who took them up could not make claims against each other for their shares in the expense of fencing. A man might take up a farm and be surrounded by others, and they might fence in their land all round him, and he would not have to pay a single penny as his share of the fencing. There was no means of making him pay his contribution towards the cost of fencing.

The HON. W. FORREST said he would point out another effect which the amendment would have, and it was a very important one. The owner of a grazing right over the resumed half of a run——

The HON. J. TAYLOR: Say a squatter at once!

The HON. W. FORREST: No. The Hon. Mr. Taylor was, he thought, becoming the President, Chairman of Committees, and the Committee rolled into one, and was running the whole business himself. A man who held the right of depasture on the resumed half of a run, was a licensee under the Bill, and under the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Thynne he would be compelled to pay a half-share for fencing put up round him, though he was liable to be removed next day.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said he did not like the amendment himself, for the reason that he believed that the squatter who held one-half of the run would be liable for payment of one half of the cost of fencing, put up by the men who settled round him.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said he thought so too. The effect of the amendment would certainly be that, in cases where the pastoral tenant brought himself under the provisions of the Bill, and got a lease in respect of the resumed half, and the licensee of a grazing farm took up any portion of the run, he could

compel the lessee of the holding under Part III. to contribute to the dividing fence. It was contemplated in the Bill, as part of the consideration which the grazing farmer should give to the country in return for the privileges granted to him, that he should put a fence round his holding, and he had to do it in a certain number of years. In the case of those persons who took up farms which were contiguous to one another, a difficulty would arise which the Hon. Mr. Thynne had suggested; but it should be remembered that the condition of fencing attached to both of the men, and if the fencing was put up on the boundaries of their holdings they would have to make some mutual arrangement. Under the amendment, an injustice not contemplated by the Bill in its present shape might be inflicted on the pastoral tenant.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he would answer the Hon. Mr. Forrest's objection first. That hon. gentleman objected that under the amendment proposed the holder of a right to depasture would be liable to contribute his share of the cost of fencing. If they looked at the interpretation clause they would see that an occupation license—which was what he really got—was a license under Part VI. of the Bill.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: He does not get an occupation license.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he did not get a lease—he only got a right to depasture. So that the fencing could only apply to lands included under a lease, and that was why he put the addition "license under Part IV. of this Act." So far as the resumed halves of runs over which a right to depasture was granted were concerned, he had specially avoided bringing them under the operation of his amendment.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: You do not say so by your amendment.

The HON. W. FORREST: Look at the interpretation clause.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he had looked at the interpretation clause; and he had expressly limited his amendment to apply only to licenses under Part IV. of the Act—merely to agricultural and grazing farms—it did not extend to any other licenses at all; it specially avoided holders of grazing rights, and all other occupation licenses, except those of grazing and agricultural farms. With regard to the cases to which the Postmaster-General had referred, where the leased half of a run happened to be contiguous to a farm, he did not see why the fencing should not apply to such cases. What was the difference between the two? One was held under a lease for fifteen years, and the other under a lease for thirty years, and that was the only difference. Why should a farmer who put up five miles of fencing to fence himself off from the man who held a lease on the other side of him for fifteen years not get one-half the cost of the fencing? It should be remembered also that there could be no harm done in making such a provision, because if the pastoral tenant paid his half-share of the fencing he would be entitled to claim compensation for it when the country was taken away from him. The amendment he proposed would work with absolute fairness to every person affected by it.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the amendment was contrary to the policy of the present law. They could not compel a pastoral tenant to join in the expense of fencing the boundary of his run unless he made use of the fence for the purpose of forming a paddock. The Bill contemplated that grazing lessees should be compelled to erect fencing. It was optional in the case of agricultural lessees; but in the case of grazing lessees it was compulsory that they should fence their holdings within a certain period, the object being that they should be compelled to keep their stock within the boundaries given them by their leases. It would be an innovation if they compelled the pastoral lessee to contribute to the erection of boundary fences which would not be of any use to him at all. He, of course, had no objection to the amendment, but he thought it necessary to point that out.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said, as the law at present stood, the pastoral lessee was liable to have to pay for fencing.

The HON. J. TAYLOR: No.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said the Hon. Mr. Taylor said "No," but he would point out to the Committee that it was so. If there were two leaseholders adjoining each other, one could compel the other to pay one-half of the fencing, although it might not be worth threepence to him; and why should not the same rule apply to everybody? It was merely a matter of the term of the lease, and he could not see why any distinction should be made between one and another.

The HON. W. GRAHAM said there was very little doubt that that "Liberal" Land Bill had been illiberal in that respect. They all understood that, however small a holding a man might have, he could call upon a squatter—he was not afraid to use the word, if others were—and he was bound to pay for the boundary fence. He had not to put up an expensive fence, but he had to put up a moderate fence. The present clause was an alteration. He did not object to it himself, but he wished to point out that it was another very illiberal and hard clause in that "Liberal" Land Bill. Under the Acts of 1868 and 1869 men might hold from 120 acres up to 360 acres, or up to 10,000 acres nearly, and the pastoral lessee had to join them in fencing. Now, because it was reduced to an agricultural holding, that was to be denied. He did not see that the mere fact that a man held a small area should deter him from being able to call upon the pastoral lessee, if their holdings joined, to assist him in paying for a fence. At the same time he thought the kind of fence should be defined.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE: It is defined in the Fencing Act.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said he could say that under the Act of 1868 he had had to pay hundreds and hundreds of pounds to selectors round him for fencing, because they happened to join his land.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE: And so you ought.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said that under the 1869 Act nothing of that sort took place. Another squatter, by running a boundary fence between his run and another's, could not oblige his neighbour to pay for the fence unless he took advantage of it by running another fence up to it to make a paddock. That was introduced by Sir Arthur Palmer. The result was that a rich squatter could not ruin a small squatter by putting up boundary fences, unless the small man chose to make use of the fences by running other fences up to them so as to form paddocks.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the Act of 1869 provided that the lessee of Crown lands adjoining a run on which a boundary fence might be erected should be exempt from payment of his share of the cost thereof so long as he did not in any way avail himself of the advantage of such fence as part of the fencing of his own run. But any selector could compel a squatter to pay one-half the cost.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he could quite understand that being the law where the leases were practically leases at six months' notice. But under this Bill they were going to give what were called indefeasible leases. It was merely a matter of the term of the lease, and both lessees should be put on the same footing.

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE moved that the clause be further amended by the insertion of the words "licensee or" before the word "lessee," in the 2nd line.

The HON. W. FORREST said he thought the word "licensee" would cover a lessee who held a right to depasture.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: No, it will not. It refers only to licensees under Part III. of the Bill.

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE moved that the words "of such license or of" be inserted before the word "lease," in the 4th line.

The HON. W. FORREST said he could not help thinking that the word "licensee" would cover the holder of a license to depasture. However, he was not going to oppose the amendment. He presumed it would be printed to-morrow, and hon. members would see it before the Bill came on for its third reading.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 121 passed with a verbal amendment.

Clauses 122 to 126, inclusive, passed as printed.

On clause 127, as follows:—

"If any commissioner, land agent, or licensed surveyor, or any district surveyor, directly or indirectly acquires any interest in any land declared open for selection under this Act, in respect of which he acts as commissioner or land agent, or in the survey of which lands he has been or is concerned, he shall forfeit his office or license as the case may be, and shall also forfeit the sum of one hundred pounds with full costs of suit, which may be recovered by any person who may sue for the same in the Supreme Court or in the nearest district court."

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he thought the provisions of that clause should be extended to members of the board.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: That is already provided for. The members of the board are prohibited from having any interest in any holding or license.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE: But there is no penalty provided in case a member of the board does acquire such an interest.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He can be dismissed.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he thought there should be some such remedy provided as was contained in that clause. It would, he believed, be a wholesome check on the members of the board to render them liable to an action at law for any malpractice, and might be the means of opening the eyes of the Government on some occasions. He would not, however, propose an amendment.

Clause passed as printed.

Clauses 128 to 138, inclusive, passed as printed.

Clause 139 passed with a verbal amendment.

Clauses 140 and 141 passed as printed.

On the 1st schedule—

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said he was very uncertain at one time whether the whole colony should be included in the schedule or not; but he thought that the land already included would be sufficient for the wants of the people for a long time to come. There was also the fact that those outside the schedule could come under the provisions of the Act if they felt inclined, so that no injustice could be done to them so far as the schedule was concerned. Under the circumstances, he should vote for the schedule as it stood.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said that on the second reading he expressed the opinion that they would very probably alter the schedule; but since the Bill had been considerably amended, and they had a better idea what the true working of the measure was likely to be, and as it was now quite clear that those who were outside the schedule would have the option of bringing themselves under the operation of the Bill, he thought both public and private interests would be best conserved by leaving the schedule as it was till the exigencies of the State demanded an extension.

Schedule put and passed.

The remaining schedules and the preamble were agreed to without discussion.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL moved that the Chairman leave the chair, and report the Bill to the House with amendments. It was his intention afterwards to ask the House to go into Committee again, for the purpose of making some amendments consequent on the excision of Part V.

The HON. A. J. THYNNE said he would suggest to the Postmaster-General the advisableness of letting the recommittal of the Bill stand over till Tuesday, so that hon. members might look it over in the meantime, in order to discover anything requiring amendment that had escaped their attention.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; and the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, the President left the chair, and the House went into Committee to reconsider clauses 1, 4, and 20.

Verbal consequential amendments having been made in the clauses mentioned,

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL moved that the Chairman leave the chair and report the Bill with further amendments.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said it was a question whether, upon going through the Bill again, as was proposed to be done, some other amendments might not be found to be necessary; and therefore, if it was the intention of the Postmaster-General to move at once that the report be adopted, it should be understood that when the Bill came on for the third reading, on the next sitting day, it would be competent for any hon. gentleman to move that it be recommitted.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: The Standing Orders provide for that.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR: There was no intention whatever of recommitting any part of the Bill that did not require to be again gone into.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said he was going to mention that when he moved the third reading of the Bill, which he intended to do on Tuesday next, it would then be competent for hon. gentlemen, if they desired to have any clause reconsidered, to move that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of considering that clause. He understood that hon. gentlemen

wished a certain clause to be reconsidered, and that in one particular they desired to retrace their steps.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR: Question!

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: When he introduced the Bill in committee he intimated that an opportunity would be afforded of recommittal upon any points that hon. gentlemen desired to further consider; and he might as well now make the intimation that he had intended to make later on. What he desired to ask was that, if the House recommitted the Bill, hon. gentlemen would allow him to move the third reading of it after it had been considered in committee. He could not do that in the ordinary course, but it was desirable, as it was near the end of the year, that after the House had made up its mind on the Bill they should be able to send it back as speedily as possible to the Legislative Assembly. He was not quite sure whether the Legislative Assembly would meet on Wednesday; it was rumoured that it would not because it was a holiday; and if they gained a day they would probably gain a week so far as the Legislative Assembly was concerned. Under the circumstances he did not anticipate that there would be any objection to allowing the Standing Orders to be suspended as far as the third reading of the Bill was concerned.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said, as far as hon. gentlemen present were concerned, there would be no objection. Of course they could not answer for others.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; and the Bill was reported with further amendments. The report was adopted, and the third reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at eleven minutes past 9 o'clock.