Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Council

WEDNESDAY, 26 AUGUST 1885

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, 26 *August*, 1885.

Absence of President.—Messages from the Governor.—Acting Chairman of Committees.—Charitable Institutions Management Bill—third reading.—Crown Lands Act of 1884 Amendment Bill—second reading.—Western Railway Extension.—Additional Members Bill.—Message from the Legislative Assembly.—Marsupials Destruction Act Continuation Bill.

The House met at 4 o'clock.

ABSENCE OF PRESIDENT.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said: Hon. gentlemen,—I have just been informed by Sir Thomas McIlwraith that our President is unavoidably absent this afternoon.

Whereupon the CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Hon. D. F. Roberts), according to the 28th Standing Order, took the chair.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN reported the receipt of messages from the Governor, intimating that the Royal assent had been given to the Pacific Island Labourers Employers Compensation Bill, the Rabbit Bill, and the Police Officers Relief Bill.

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL moved that the Hon. A. J. Thynne be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for this day.

Question put and passed.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS MANAGEMENT BILL—THIRD READING.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Legislative Assembly by message in the usual form.

CROWN LANDS ACT OF 1884 AMENDMENT BILL—SECOND READING.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said: Hon. gentlemen,—In moving the second reading of this Bill, which is a Bill to amend the Crown Lands Act of 1884, with respect to the selection of land before survey and in other respects, you will notice that the pith of the Bill is practically to be found in clause 2, which has for its object to give the Governor in Council power to suspend the operation of the 43rd section of the Land Act of 1884, in regard to certain land in districts named in the schedule of the Bill. I think it would be well that I should read you this section 43 of the principal Act, which is a very simple one:—

"Before any land is so proclaimed open for selection it shall be surveyed under the direction of the Surveyor-General and divided into lots of convenient area for selection, with proper roads and reserves for public purposes, and such lots shall be marked on the ground by posts not less than three feet in height at the corners of the lots."

That clause affirmed the principle of survey before selection; and since the passing of the Act it has been found, as I think most hon. members of this Chamber are aware, that it is desirable that certain land in certain districts specified in the schedule before referred to should be made available to the general public for selection before survey. It will be apparent to us all, I think, that these districts where selection has taken place since the operation of the Act of 1868 have been well weeded of all the good land—in fact, all lands of both the first and second classes have practically been absorbed during the past seventeen years; but there are still many little remnants and patches of country in these districts which are very inaccessible indeed to persons other than those resident in the districts. They are, in fact, really only known to those who are resident in the districts, and it is considered to be a wise thing to give the Governor in Council power to suspend the operation of clause 43 for the purpose of enabling these sundry pieces of land to be taken up by selectors and their friends. This really is the object of this amending Bill—to enable these sundry pieces of land, which are to be found all over the colony in out-of-the-way places, to be taken up. It is desirable that every facility should be given to selectors to take them up before survey. Indeed, it will hardly pay to have a surveyor traversing all the country to find out where these pieces of land are; and hence it is proposed to deal with the districts mentioned in the Bill in the manner provided in clause 2. The following are the districts mentioned in the schedule—namely, Beenleigh, Brisbane, Ipswich, Toowoomba, Warwick, Gympie, Maryborough, Bundaberg, Gladstone, and Rockhampton. I do not propose to go into the details of the subsections of clause 2 at any length to day, because we can deal with them better in committee, but I would draw attention to clause 3 of the Bill, which provides as follows:—

"When any selector of land under the provisions of the Crown Lands Alienation Act of 1876, who resides personally and *bonâ fide* thereon, or any owner in fee of land which, if it had not been alienated from the Crown, would be country land, who resides personally and *bonâ fide* thereon, selects under Part IV. of the Crown Lands Act of 1884 other country land adjoining the land whereon he so resides, he shall in such case, but for so long only as he continuously and *bonâ fide*

resides on either portion of land, be exempt from performance of the condition of occupation in respect of the other."

There is also a proviso to that clause to this effect:—

"Provided that such exemption shall not extend to any selections of greater area in the aggregate than the maximum area allowed to be selected by one person in the district, inclusive of the land whereon the selector resides."

Clause 4 is a very wise provision indeed, and has the effect of disenabling persons from acquiring homesteads without residence. Then you will observe in clause 5 amendments upon subsection 4 of section 74 of the principal Act. This clause 5 is practically to enable selectors to acquire by selection land in their own district up to the area permitted under the Act of 1884. It would be a great hardship, for instance, if a lessee who held an area of 640 acres were not permitted to take up land to the full extent allowed by the Act of 1884—namely, 1,280 acres. There is no reason why he should not be able to extend his area to the maximum provided for in the principal Act. The justice of that provision therefore will, I think, not be gainsaid by any hon. member. Then clause 6 begins by stating that doubts have arisen as to the total amount which may become payable as rent by a lessee of an agricultural farm, and it provides that where such a lessee has paid a sum equal to 2s. 6d. per acre of the land comprised in the farm he shall be entitled to have returned to him a sum equal to the difference between the sum paid and a sum equal to 2s. 6d. per acre. I do not think I need go any further into the Bill just at present, because I feel sure it will receive very full consideration in committee, and I therefore beg to move that it be read a second time.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said: Honourable gentlemen,—The Bill which we have now before us is one which we had good reason to expect when we went through the exceedingly frail measure of last session. I then took the opportunity to point out to the Postmaster-General some of its defects; and the great defect of this Bill is that it is patching the original Act. If the Government had taken the trouble to inquire what would be a reasonable mode of doing what they want to do—that is, to facilitate the subdivision and occupation of land—they would not have gone this roundabout way to work. The great principle of the original Act, as asserted last session, was selection after survey, but now we have a direct proposition to set aside that principle, as far as it applies to ten different districts. It is not so much a question of the incongruity of the Bill, but it may be just as well for me to point out to the Postmaster-General what would be the correct way of getting at the object the Government have now in view, in order to reduce at the same time the cost of surveys and facilitate the occupation of the land. Now, if the Government would just altogether set aside what they have already done in the principal Act, and what they propose to do here, and adopt the system of making a general feature survey of the country which would be declared open for selection, they would be doing a much wiser thing. In the first instance, all the main roads should be laid out; then of course the subsidiary roads would follow. Then the boundaries of every selection would come in. They might then mark out some of the most important public reserves, and there should also be a feature survey of those main features of the country, such as watercourses, or any feature which ought to be a boundary of selections. Well, a plan like that put in the hands of any land commissioner, even if he only possessed a moderate amount of knowledge—in fact, without the possession of any actual professional knowledge, would enable him to adjust and arrange the subdivision of selections, so that each person could take up the quantity of land which he required. Now, the system of survey before selection involves this very serious difficulty, that a man who wants 100 acres often finds that 200 acres have been surveyed in the position in which he wishes to take up his selection, and probably his means will not permit him to take that amount up. Another man, perhaps, would like 400 acres in the same locality, but he can only take up 200. The great disadvantage of survey before selection is that if the boundaries have been marked out it might be three or four years before they would be utilised. Some will be lost, and others, through the accidents of fire and flood, will be wiped out, and when the selector comes on to the ground the Government will have to resurvey and incur a second charge for doing so. Practically, therefore, the Government will have a nominal survey on paper, and another survey will have to be made when the selector wishes to put up his fence. The cost of the system which I point out would be considerably less than will be the cost of any payment for survey before selection, and the same remark can be applied to those particular cases here in which it is stated that there are a large number of pieces of land scattered about in all directions which, according to the Postmaster-General, surveyors can scarcely find. The Government propose that these should be thrown open to selection before survey. Now, would it not be far better in those districts—and not only in the ones mentioned, but the larger ones—to have the land roughly surveyed so as to enable selectors to take up those portions which they may require. The method I propose would be far quicker and far cheaper than the expensive system proposed by the Government. I think that hon. gentlemen will at once see that if any one of them was desirous to select land in any district and he could be shown a map of the important features of the country—the main roads and the main watercourses, and the important public reserves—he could very easily, under some very simple rules, take his pencil and ruler and mark off, say, 600, or 2,000, or 50 acres, just as he might require. Then, as regards the question of his being able to occupy—with a map like that he could have no difficulty whatever, because to a great extent he would have everything that is necessary and would not be compelled to fence in the whole of the boundaries. The greater portion of the boundaries would in most cases be found to have been defined by the feature survey. The cost of such a feature survey would not amount to one-fourth part of what the survey of the land into portions ready to select would cost; and, as I have already said, the other system has this disadvantage—that if, say, half-a-million acres are surveyed, before one-tenth of the land is selected the boundary marks will be so depreciated that a selector cannot possibly fence in his land without having those marks replaced. The Government would have to go through the course of survey after selection in actual fact. They have pledged themselves to a certain system and it will be difficult to get out of it. I am not speaking from a party point of view, but from a professional point of view, and my object is to so apportion the land that the wishes of parties desiring to acquire it and the interests of the public can be best met, and the expense reduced to a minimum. The Government ought, between this time and next session, to earnestly look at the thing as a matter of business and not as a party question, and do what they can

to facilitate the occupation of the country and cheapen the cost of marking the boundaries of the selections. I say they can if they will earnestly turn their attention towards it, and though I scarcely expect them to turn to me for advice, I would be ready and willing to give my time to assist them in preparing a measure which would contribute to so valuable and important an object.

Question put and passed, and committal of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

WESTERN RAILWAY EXTENSION.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Assembly transmitting, for the approval of the Council, the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed extension of the Western Railway from 299 miles 37 chains (from Dalby) to Charleville, as laid upon the table of the House, on Tuesday, the 18th day of August, instant.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS BILL.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, the Presiding Chairman left the chair, and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the message of the Legislative Assembly of 13th August, in regard to this Bill.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the Legislative Assembly, after considering the amendments made by the Council to the Additional Members Bill, disagreed to them for the following reasons :—

"Because they would allow of the addition of names to the electoral rolls without any provision for the prevention or detection of false or unfounded claims.

"Because it is not desirable that claims to be inserted on an electoral roll should be allowed without the names of the claimants being publicly notified, and full opportunity being given for lodging objections to such claims as may be unfounded.

"Because the small number of persons who would really be entitled to have their names inserted on both rolls does not warrant the delay in bringing the Act into operation, which would be necessarily caused by a proper scheme for dealing with new claims."

His motion would be that the Council do not insist on their amendments; and, in speaking to that motion, he felt that it would be almost a waste of time to go over the ground which most hon. gentlemen traversed in the discussion of the Bill. He did not think anything new could be said, and though he had very great respect for the opinions enunciated when the Bill was under consideration he respectfully suggested that his motion should be carried in view of the delay which would necessarily occur if they adhered to their amendment. It had been very well said elsewhere that of the two evils they should choose the less, and all sides of the Chamber would agree that there was a little evil in the possible exclusion of certain voters from exercising their right at the coming elections in the Mitchell and Musgrave electorates. But the amendment referred to those persons who were already registered voters, and that provision, if carried out, would delay the elections in those districts. Under all the circumstances, he trusted the Chamber would see its way to adopt his motion. He therefore moved that the Council do not insist on their amendments.

The HON. F. T. GREGORY said that as he was the mover of the amendments referred to in the message of the Legislative Assembly he felt it his duty briefly to place before the Committee the reasons why they ought to insist on those amendments; at the same time he did not mean to say that he intended to move a motion to that effect, but he was anxious to hear the opinions of hon. members before deciding the question one way or the other. Probably the strongest argument which could be advanced against the amendments was the delay which might take place in bringing the Bill into operation, but he questioned whether it would produce that effect. There was no doubt that if the Government chose the whole matter could be carried through quite as quickly as if the amendments were withdrawn, and the only question was whether there was any weight in the statement that the rolls might be stuffed by not allowing sufficient time to examine the claims of persons whose names were put on the roll. He doubted whether any name would be put on the roll by anyone who had no right to do so, but if such a thing should happen it might be struck off by the revision court. The next thing to consider was that probably a large number would be disfranchised—at any rate for the present election, and possibly for the next three years—if the amendments were not retained. He did not know the intentions of the Government; they might have a dissolution in view or they might be aware that the sitting member wished to retire. He did not like to impute motives, but one was justified in imagining that they were afraid of the consequences of allowing the rolls to be made up with additional names, the result of which might be averse to their present policy. He had been at some little pains to ascertain the probable number of electors who might be disfranchised by the amendments being struck out, and the estimate varied from 600 to 1,000. He should not be surprised if no less than 1,000 electors in the present district of Townsville were disfranchised through the rejection of the amendment, and if that were the case the Government would only be doing justice to Townsville if they even delayed the election for an additional member for the sake of getting the rolls complete. Since the Government had so studiously resisted the amendments, which every member of the Council supported without reference to party feeling, they could not cast any greater odium upon the Government than quietly allowing their disagreement to hold and letting the responsibility of disfranchising a considerable portion of the electors of the district rest upon them. It was only on behalf of the electors that he would still resist the rejection of the amendments.

The HON. W. APLIN said he was very sorry the other Chamber could not see its way to allow the amendments passed by the Council to remain in the Bill, as their rejection would very seriously affect the electorate of Townsville. To his certain knowledge many people there were qualified to be on the roll for the Musgrave district as freeholders, and it was a great hardship that they should be disfranchised for some years to come—till the next general election—which would be the result if the amendments were rejected. At the same time he should not like to see the Bill imperilled by any action that Chamber might take with regard to the amendments.

The HON. A. C. GREGORY said the question at issue was whether they should insist upon amendments made in the Bill, the object of which was to avoid disfranchising a large number of those who were at the present time electors in the combined district of Townsville and Musgrave. The objection first made was that the amendments would have no effect, because the number to whom it would give a qualification would be very small; and almost in the same breath it was said that the amendments would apply to no less than 3,000 who ought not to be on the roll—a most extraordinary discrepancy. It was alleged that time would be lost if the amendments were retained; but there would not be one single day lost on that account. It was

true that some persons who might be electors in Townsville might make application to be placed on the roll for Musgrave without due qualification, but though the advantage of the publication of names would be lost there would still be the revision court, which was the only court that struck names off the roll. Practically, therefore, the objection raised to names being placed on the supplementary list was a mere nullity. The Government had announced their determination to oppose the amendment; and even if it became law, they could by executive action so arrange things as to leave it inoperative, and under the circumstances it was not of very much importance whether it was retained or not. If the Government had wished they would gladly have availed themselves of the amendment as an opportunity to do something both just and popular. But they had not done so, and under the circumstances he thought it as well to leave them to their own devices. The only thing he would point out was that the Government were perfectly well aware that there would not be any member elected for either Musgrave or Townsville who would be able to sit during the present session of Parliament. There was a remedy, however, which the Government ought to apply even without the amendment. They ought to defer the elections until January, by which time those who would be disfranchised by an earlier election would be able to get their names on the roll for Musgrave—he mentioned that electorate as an illustration—and record their votes for a member who might take his seat next session. That plan would be far better than having the elections at an earlier date, thus preventing many persons from being able to record their votes probably for the next three years. As he said before, the remedy was in the hands of the Government if they chose to apply it, though he was sorry to say he scarcely expected they would do so. He had already pointed out that by executive action they could defeat the object of the amendment, and that being so he did not see any use in that Chamber insisting on its retention in the Bill.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said he must beg leave to express his surprise at one observation which fell from the lips of the last speaker, to the effect that the Government had no intention of seeing that the new members of those respective districts should take their seats during the present session. Now, who was responsible for that, he should ask—to some extent at any rate? He thought the history of that Bill was most creditable to the Government, because on one of the earliest days of the session they brought it in in order that the elections should take place at the very earliest possible moment. The Bill had been amended in that Chamber, and therefore, if it happened that the new members, when elected, were only able to do what the Hon. Mr. Gregory suggested they might be able to do—that was, make their bow and walk out—the amendments made in the Bill would be to blame for it, because otherwise those members would have sat for a fortnight or three weeks. Now, it was just as well that the desire of the Assembly to have the Bill come into force as quickly as possible should be plainly announced, as shown by the circumstance that it passed without amendment; and he knew that some members of the other branch of the Legislature had in view the subject-matter of the amendment in question, but it was found that if they went into the question the intentions of the Government, in having the new members take their seats as early as possible, would be frustrated. He thought what he had said as to the honesty of the intentions of the Government was a suitable reply to the innuendo, or something more than that, which escaped the lips of the hon. gentleman. The amendment, as hon. gentlemen were aware, was confined to registered voters. It would be giving votes to those who already had votes, but withheld votes from those who presently had none. It was a pity that they could not give these men their votes, whatever their number might be, but they would have the consolation of having additional representation in the other Chamber. He sincerely hoped that the Committee would agree to his motion, which he was quite prepared to regard as the lesser evil. He thought they should adopt the lesser evil and not delay the Bill another moment. He thought it was only fair that he should take the opportunity of saying that the Government desired to bring the Bill into operation as quickly as possible.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, and reported that the Committee did not insist upon their amendment.

The report was adopted, and the Bill ordered to be returned to the Legislative Assembly by message in the usual form.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN reported the receipt of a message from the Legislative Assembly, forwarding, for the approval of the Council, the plans, sections, and book of reference of the proposed railway from Mackay to Eton.

MARSUPIALS DESTRUCTION ACT CONTINUATION BILL.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, the House went into Committee to consider the message of the Legislative Assembly of the 18th August, disagreeing to the amendment made by the Council in this Bill.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the reasons given by the Legislative Assembly for disagreeing to the amendment of the Council in the Marsupials Destruction Act Continuation Bill, were as follows:—

"Because it is desirable to encourage the destruction of dingoes, and the existing law is inadequate to effect that object.

"Because in many cases the dingo is, as well as the marsupial, the natural enemy of stockowners; and it is therefore reasonable that the moneys raised from them for the destruction of one class of natural enemies should be permitted to be applied also for the destruction of the other.

"Because the clause provides sufficient safeguards against any abuse of its provisions."

He did not intend to take up the time of the Committee by any advocacy of the question, because he thought that it was very fully discussed when the Bill was before the House, and some very excellent information was given by one or more hon. gentlemen on the subject. The question was one which was peculiarly well known to most hon. members of that Chamber; but he might make one observation, and one only, before he sat down, and it was this, that the operation of the clause in dispute being practically optional in the different districts of the colony, he thought they might very safely leave it as it had come from the Assembly. He therefore begged to move that the Committee do not insist upon their amendment.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said he had not changed his opinion at all since the Bill was last before the House, and he still considered that it would be a much better Bill if all mention of the dingo were omitted from it. He

had not risen with the view of moving an amendment upon the Postmaster-General's motion, although if the Committee came to a division he should act as he had done before. He noticed that there had been no division whatever upon the question in the Assembly, and it simply remained as it was—a moot point. The Postmaster-General had said that the clause in question was optional, and he (Hon. Mr. Murray-Prior) knew that it could be made optional, but it all depended upon the feeling of the marsupial board on the question. The matter was one which he did not think it became that Chamber to wrangle over after having expressed its opinion; and believing that it was a question of not very great moment, he would refrain from moving an amendment. If, however, there was a division he should certainly support his convictions.

The HON. J. TAYLOR said he was not present when the Bill went through committee, but if he had been he should have supported the retention of the dingo in the Bill. They had heard so many opinions for and against the destruction of the dingo that he, for one, had at first been rather bothered, but he had lately spoken to one or two practical men, and he had made up his mind most decidedly that the dingo ought to go. On that opinion he would act. He had had a great deal to do with the working of previous Marsupial Acts, and he must say they had been most beneficial to the country; and no matter whether the dingo or the eagle-hawk or anything else was inserted in the Bill it would be better for them to let it stand as it was than lose the measure. In the part of the country where he lived some hundreds of thousands of animals had been destroyed, and altogether the Act had done a vast amount of good. He should support the Bill with a very great deal of pleasure, and hoped it would pass without any further amendment.

The Hon. G. KING said he was not present, unfortunately, when the Bill passed through Committee, but had he been he would have voted for the retention of the clause in question. One did not like to speak of one's personal experience but yet there was no other way in which hon. members could relate their impressions and convictions about the matter. He would mention as a matter of fact that when he bought Gowrie, in 1868, out of a herd of cattle, including 700 or 800 cows, their produce never amounted to more than 130 to 150 calves, and it was not until a raid was made upon the native dogs that he succeeded in rearing cattle in any numbers. He had experienced the same trouble with regard to sheep on account of the dogs, and he could state as a fact that on his property the average of no less than three dogs per week were killed in the past, and that his annual loss through the dingo was then from 500 to 700 sheep.

The HON. J. TAYLOR: Crossbreeds?

The HON. G. KING said: Yes; also crossbred dogs. He noticed the Hon. Mr. Thynne had supported the exclusion of the dingo from the operation of the Bill in a very spirited manner, but if that hon. gentleman had had as many clients bitten by dogs as he (Mr. King) had sheep killed he would throw up his brief. His hon. friend (Mr. W. Forrest) had risen sublime on the question and had quoted Scripture in support of his views. He appealed to Scripture in support of their protection to the dingo, and told the Committee to take warning by the words of Moses which he read. There was no necessity for him (Mr. King) to read an extract of the hon. gentleman's speech; they were led to infer by the Hon. Mr. Forrest that the dingo, in our social economy, was placed in the same position relatively to the marsupial as the Canaanites and Hittites were to the Children of Israel; that Moses imposed on those nations the same duties as the dingo was supposed to perform towards the marsupial. That statement had made a deep impression upon his (Mr. King's) mind, but for all that he could not give a vote in favour of the dingo, and would vote for the retention of the clause.

The HON. W. GRAHAM said he must stand up for the knowledge of Scripture displayed by his hon. friend Mr. Forrest—especially in his absence. He could quote the exact words quoted by that hon. gentleman without looking it up; but he thought that although the hon. gentleman quoted the words correctly, he quoted them to the wrong effect. The words were to the effect that when a nation was taken charge of just in the same way as we had taken over the Australian nation, it was not wise to destroy the inhabitants too quickly, in case the beasts of the field rose up and were too much for us. He (Mr. Graham) found that this was the very occasion on which the inhabitants in the shape of the dingo had risen up and destroyed us. Where the quotation of the Hon. Mr. Forrest came in as appropriate he was not prepared to say, but he was thoroughly sound so far as his religion was concerned. Although the Hon. Mr. Forrest was right in condemning both natives and their aides-de-camp, the dogs, in too soon destroying the marsupials, yet the dingo was not to be considered in his wild state as their assistant. He believed that the Hon. Mr. Forrest had found out his mistake, and that that was the reason why they did not see him present now that the matter was being further discussed.

The HON. A. RAFF said, referring to what had been stated by the Hon. Mr. King, he could inform the Committee that he had an opportunity of testing the matter lately in a way that very few hon. members had done. When interested in a station property on the other side of the Main Range, he had cattle on one station, and did not poison the dogs. He had sheep on the neighbouring station, and did poison the dogs; and he found no perceptible difference in the number of marsupials upon either station. Lately, he became interested in a station on the Darling Downs, and in a scrubby part of the country, between Warra and Chinchilla, there were three open plains, to reach which about two and a-half miles of scrub country had to be passed through. There was no water, however, on those plains, and he resolved to sink wells, and went to considerable expense with that object. After doing so, he was informed that he was very foolish, because wallabies always infested those plains, but he said in reply it was rather surprising that there were no wallabies there at the time. He was then told that a disease had been amongst the wallabies, and consequently there were very few on the plains. Well, he also found that there were large numbers of native dogs there, and he thought that the dogs had something to do in keeping down the wallabies. Notwithstanding that the shepherds were always complaining that they were disturbed at night by the dogs—the sheep being enclosed in stake-yards—he refrained from poisoning the dogs, and they increased in great numbers. When some of his neighbours came to poison the dogs they were ordered off because he wanted to protect the dogs to keep down the marsupials. He was very anxious to keep down the wallabies, so that he would not have to go to the expense of fencing. Everything, in fact, was done to protect the dogs, and they increased by hundreds, with the result that the country was now simply overrun with both dogs and marsupials. Fencing, of course, had eventually to be resorted

to at the considerable cost of some £3,000 or £4,000 to keep the wallabies out, although the dogs still existed in great numbers. He thought that that must prove conclusively that although native dogs did kill wallabies and kangaroos, when the former were present the latter did not cease to be a pest.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, the CHAIRMAN left the chair and reported that the Committee did not insist upon their amendment. The report was adopted, and the Bill ordered to be returned to the Legislative Assembly by message in the usual form.

The House adjourned at half-past 5 o'clock.