Legislative Council,

Thursday, 7th December, 1905.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4·30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL LANDS NEAR MIDLAND RAILWAY.

HON. W. PATRICK asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What is the area of agricultural land belonging to the State adjoining and within 15 miles of the Midland Railway? 2, Is it the intention of the Government to offer this land for settlement, and if so, when?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The area of the Crown lands within 15 miles of the Midland Railway is about 1,230,000 acres. A large percentage of this land is of an inferior description. The amount of agricultural land within it cannot be stated, as no classification surveys over it have been made. 2, This land is now open for selection, as its temporary reservation was removed on the 18th of September last.

BILLS—THIRD READING.

Perth Mint Act Amendment.

Permanent Reserve Rededication.

BILL—FISHERIES.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Regulations:

HON. F. M. STONE: Persons authorised to issue licenses should be enabled also to refuse licenses. Persons took out licenses simply as a cloak. They had boats, and went ashore, committed robberies and got into their boats again. Licensees had assaulted inspectors. These persons should not have licenses at all. There should be some discretion with the person issuing licenses to refuse them. But any person who liked to pay a fee could now get a license. Inspectors had been grievously assaulted.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was provided for later on.

HON. F. M. STONE: There should be a provision by which licenses could be refused, and if necessary the number of licenses should be limited.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would be well to have power to refuse licenses, and when Clause 11 was reached a proviso might be added. He moved an amendment to carry out a suggestion made by Captain Laurie, that the following be inserted to stand as Subclause (*m.*):—

"Appointing places for landing fish, and prohibiting the landing of fish except at an appointed landing place.

HON. M. F. STONE: Fish were caught, and were thrown away to keep up the price in the market. All fish caught should be placed on the market and not wasted. The public should have an opportunity of getting cheaper fish when large catches were made.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Subclause (*j.*) would prevent the destruction of fish; but it was questionable whether we could put the desired construction on the subclause. Could we really interfere in that direction equitably? [HON. F. M. STONE thought so.] The fish was the absolute property of the fisherman; and so long as he disposed of it without injury to his fellow-man and without causing a nuisance, it was a moot point as to whether we could stop him. He (the Colonial Secretary) would like to stop the practice if we could do it legally and equitably; but it seemed to be rather a fine point. He regretted that such instances had occurred, but how to get over the trouble was a question of considerable difficulty.

HON. F. M. STONE: We could bring in a regulation that all boats bringing in fish should be emptied at the landing place. The difficulty was in dealing with the fishermen out at sea.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: In the north of Scotland last year he visited a town where a large fishing industry was carried on. Fish were only allowed to be brought to the fish market, and once laid down were not allowed to be taken away again. They were sold by auction and knocked down to the highest bidder.

We could get over the difficulty here by compelling the fishermen to land the fish at one place and then selling it by auction.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The course suggested was already being followed. This amendment would prohibit fish being landed at any other spot, and provision was included in the Municipalities Amendment Bill now before the House, to enable municipalities to compel fishermen to sell fish wholesale at certain places only. He did not see how the object sought to be achieved by Mr. Stone could be attained. If people threw away fish when out at sea there was no way of getting at them. Again, if the inspector at the landing place insisted on the fishermen emptying their boats, the fishermen might make excuses that they wanted the fish for private use, or for bait, or for a hundred other things. With the clause in the Municipalities Amendment Bill enabling the establishment of proper fish markets, no doubt the few instances of fish being thrown away through the markets being glutted would not recur. The present incentive to do this was particularly owing to the fact that there had been in operation a ring of wholesale dealers, who held auctions very often in a language foreign to the fishermen.

HON. F. M. STONE: A regulation could be provided that fishermen must give to the inspector a return of all fish caught. If the amendment were postponed, we might be able to arrive at a way of overcoming the difficulty.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY thought there was no necessity to postpone the amendment. He had no objection to recommitting the Bill to put in an amendment to the desired effect, if such an amendment could be easily and comprehensively drafted. He would consult the Crown law authorities about it.

Amendment passed and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Persons to furnish returns of fish:

HON. G. RANDELL: It was probably easy to propose such a clause, but it was hard to comply with. It would be extremely difficult to carry out the provision, which might involve hardship on someone. How did the section operate in the New South Wales Act?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was found that there had not been much difficulty about the operation of this section in New South Wales. It would enable the Fisheries Department to keep a closer watch on the fish caught and on the importance of the industry, and to ascertain the most fertile places for fish life. Altogether, it would be conducive to the best working of the department. Hitherto the estimate of fish caught in Western Australia had been based on the railway returns, or was otherwise guesswork. The management of fish markets under the Municipalities Bill would render the carrying out of this clause very much easier. The clause was qualified by the words "if so required."

HON. F. M. STONE: The clause would probably work a hardship. At Mandurah, for instance, if a boat came in with schnapper, and some people about Mandurah got fish from the boat and sold it to visitors, they would be required to furnish a list to the department every week under penalty of £2. It seemed rather absurd to make them keep a list of fish sold in such an off-hand way.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman who had just resumed his seat would notice that the clause said "if so required." We must presuppose some little modicum of discretion on the part of the inspectors, and he did not think that in an instance such as that quoted a return would be required. [HON. F. M. STONE: One did not know when he would be called upon.] Quite so, but it would really not be any great hardship if a return had to be kept. Although we had an immense coast-line, that part used for fishing was much less than the part of the New South Wales coast-line which came under the Act relating to fisheries. The Act had not been found to work any great injustice there and he did not anticipate that it would here.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 16 to 42—agreed to.

Clause 43—Annual report:

HON. F. M. STONE: In relation to Clause 34 he had intended to make a suggestion, but that could be done on recommittal. The Bill should make it an

offence for any person to prevent an inspection of a boat by an inspector. A fishing boat might be cutting along and the boatman be called upon to stop, but instead of doing that he might pull away.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Escaping by flight should be rendered an offence under the Act, and an aggravation of the crime or default, if any, which those persons committed. He was willing to accept a clause to that effect on recommittal.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 44—agreed to.

Schedules (two)—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 167:

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY the word "another," in line 7, was struck out, and "any adjacent" inserted in lieu.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Fish hawkers' licenses for several districts:

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: This clause could be improved by inserting the words "or roads board district" between "municipality" and "adjacent to." The clause provided that a hawker could go from one municipality to another. Around the municipalities there were often roads board districts. The Perth Roads Board district was just outside the Perth municipality. He wished the amendment improved so that a fish hawker could go out of a municipality into a roads board district within the radius approved by the Bill.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Was the hon. member satisfied that could not be done under the present clause?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE did not think that was quite clear.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY thought it explicitly stated that one could hawk fish within 10 miles of a municipality.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE did not think so.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: There were several places such as Maylands and other populous parts that were not municipalities but were within roads boards districts, and yet they were within a few miles of Perth.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If other members were satisfied, he certainly was not, that if this clause were passed persons would be prohibited from hawking fish in such places. [HON. M. L. Moss: They would not be.] The object of the clause was not to confer the power of hawking so much as to improve the conditions under which hawking was done, so that instead of having to take out licenses in three or four districts, as in the case of Fremantle, East Fremantle, and North Fremantle, one license would do for the whole. The clause provided that one license should do for a district instead of a municipality.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Only two or three words were needed, and the position should be made clear.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Under Section 159 of the principal Act, the council of a municipality had power to grant licenses for various purposes, including the hawking of fruit, fish, and vegetables. It had been found that a council could only grant a hawker's license to take effect in the proclaimed boundaries of its own municipality; and that had inflicted a hardship on people carrying on this particular trade, especially in Fremantle, where there were three municipalities bordering on the river. By this Bill there would be no objection to hawking in any municipality adjacent to another or any adjacent roads board district within 10 miles from the boundaries of the municipality where the license was granted. There seemed to be misapprehension as to the intention of the clause.

HON. F. M. STONE: The 10 miles would cover the places which had been mentioned. If a license were granted in Perth, the holder would have a right to hawk fish within 10 miles of Perth.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In a municipality within 10 miles.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If there was any doubt the Government could insert after "municipality" the words "or road district." He moved an amendment accordingly.

HON. W. MALEY: The Bill was to amend the law relating to municipalities. How could it affect a roads board district, or make it an offence for an unlicensed hawker to sell fish in such district even 100 miles distant from the nearest municipality?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The last speaker had put his finger on a weak spot. Mr. Moss suggested inserting the word "locality" instead of "municipality or roads board district."

Amendment withdrawn.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Would it be necessary for a country shopkeeper to take out a license to hawk fish around a country town? That was a frequent practice in Great Southern towns, where there was no ice for refrigerating purposes.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: By the Bill, whatever rights to sell fish were enjoyed by shopkeepers or others in any locality were amplified and not restricted.

HON. F. M. STONE moved an amendment:

That the words "in any municipality adjacent to, or," in lines 3 and 4, be struck out.

The clause would then permit any hawker licensed in any municipality to sell fish therein, or within 10 miles from the boundaries thereof.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 5—postponed.

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Power to make tree reserves:

HON. J. W. HACKETT: This clause was an innovation of the most modern kind, by which the streets of municipalities were to be reduced in width and the convenience of the public limited, whereas the streets and footpaths should rather be widened. Some time ago the width of St. George's Terrace and Mount Street became an offence to certain persons connected with the Perth City Council; and at their suggestion the entire centre of that end of St. George's Terrace next to Adelaide Terrace, and part of the centre of Mount Street were cut up; heaps of sand, in which it was impossible for anything to grow, being surrounded by large boulders of ironstone. These obstructions became a menace to passengers, and accidents were frequent. One man who was seriously injured in St. George's Terrace recovered from the council heavy damages. Instead of admitting the failure of their experiment, the council now asked Parliament for power to put such obstacles in the public thoroughfares, while relieving the council of the liability for consequent accidents. The clause should be struck out. All obstacles should be removed from roads and footpaths. The Perth Council had been exceedingly negligent, for the tramway company were allowed to encroach on the footpaths to the extent of two feet or more. The tramway poles should be next the kerb. The obstacles which the Perth streets presented to the wayfarer gave Perth a distinctly low place amongst capital cities of Australia; for in no other capital would such obstacles be tolerated. The clause appeared to be taken from the Victorian Act; but the only streets in Melbourne having tree reserves in the centre were streets of two chains and upward in width.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It was time that persons responsible for marking out new townships made the streets reasonably wide, to give opportunity for beautifying them. In this sunny country the width of streets should not be limited to one chain, there being no scarcity of land.

HON. C. SOMMERS was inclined to support the clause. Until Mount Street was beautified by central reserves, it was almost impossible to keep in repair; and by planting shrubs much could be done to beautify St. George's Terrace. If we were to do away with the flower-beds we might as well do away with the lamp-posts, for one was as great obstruction as the other. Stirling Street was a wide thoroughfare, and the municipality should be allowed to beautify such a street. It was no use having wide streets if they could not be kept in good repair.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Many of the footpaths in Perth were a disgrace, and he was surprised that the Perth Council had not been mulcted in heavy damages. In Barrack Street, verandah posts were quite a yard on the footpath. He was inclined to support street reserves because in our climate it was nice to have trees and flowers in a street if the thoroughfare were wide enough. If the

Perth Council had persevered sufficiently they might not have had to pay the damages in the case referred to. He agreed with the Perth Council in making the reserve in St. George's Terrace, and a similar improvement had been effected in Mount Street. Something should be done with Stirling Street in this direction. These so called obstructions were to be found in all up-to-date cities in the world. In Melbourne, street reserves were being set out in thoroughfares only a chain and a-half wide.

HON. W. MALEY while admiring the reserves in the streets, failed to see their utility. This clause would not find favour with the present municipal council of Perth. He lived in Mount Street, and had noticed the obstruction in that street. The society for the prevention of cruelty to animals should, he thought, suggest that the flower beds be removed, if only to benefit the dumb animals that had to drag vehicles up the hill. It was really cruel to take a horse straight up a hill without a chance of zig-zagging. The Committee should protect, as far as possible, the ratepayers by seeing that these plantations were not made.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: These sand-patches in the middle of the road had been miscalled flower-beds. All he had seen growing in these beds were water melons or rock melons. The streets of Perth were narrow enough without taking out of the centre large blocks for the purpose of planting vegetables. Mount Street was an absolute danger to the public, for if a horse ran away in that street there was no getting away from the obstructions in the road. It must have cost the municipality, in putting down and pulling up the reserves and in law costs, fully £2,000. If that money had been spent in making the principal street of the city, St. George's Terrace, clean and better, it would have been well spent. He did not think that in the whole of Australia could more ill-kept and dirty streets be found. It would be unwise to allow the Perth Council to again commit such an act of folly by making reserves. The Perth Council should give their attention to keeping the streets clean and decently macadamised without going in for these innovations.

HON. R. LAURIE would vote for the clause for no other reason than that it would aim a blow at the root of the municipal management to strike it out. If the Perth Council had placed obstructions in the streets of the city, that was no reason why the municipalities in other towns should be prevented from beautifying their streets.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Most members would agree with the idea of planting trees to beautify towns, but there was ample provision for the purpose in Clause 9. The proper place to plant trees was alongside the footpaths, where they would give shade to pedestrians; but this clause was most objectionable. We had the example of Perth, where the ratepayers' money was spent in planting trees in streets which were not wide enough. Also the maximum length provided, one-eighth of a mile, was too long. These reserves would give no shade to horses or pedestrians, and the councils should rather devote attention to keeping footpaths in better order. The words "on both sides" were capable of two constructions. The clause should be struck out, and any particular municipality with streets sufficiently wide desiring the power to plant these tree reserves could have a special amending Bill passed through Parliament. In any case, the streets of Perth and Fremantle were not wide enough, and he, from his experience in the Perth Council, was not prepared to trust that council with the power given in this clause.

HON. G. RANDELL: Captain Laurie had talked about striking at the root of the responsibility of municipal councils; but if the hon. member read the Bill he would see that the root was already destroyed, for apparently the Government would not trust the councils to do these things without the Governor's consent. The object of planting tree reserves would be to have them wide enough to put in seats under shady trees; but no streets in Perth or Fremantle were wide enough for that, nor were they in any other place this side of Kalgoorlie. Probably in Kalgoorlie they might get some benefit from what was evidently a desirable thing, but not from the eyesores and nuisances such as had recently been seen in Perth. The widest street in Perth was Stirling Street, 104ft. wide, and St.

George's Terrace was 102ft. wide in places. Therefore, under this clause a tree reserve could not be planted in Perth streets. If a municipality wanted this permission it could be given by a special amending Bill. The words "available for traffic" were open to misconstruction; and there was the inconvenience of having reserves possibly 10 chains long, which was an absurd distance. We should not pass the clause in its present state.

HON. C. SOMMERS: One would think members were dealing with the traffic of London or New York. The clause provided that, after allowing for a 15ft. path, there should be 31ft. for vehicular traffic on each side of a tree reserve. Hay Street was only 50ft. wide, including footpaths; and the traffic seemed to get along all right. Members should recollect that we were dealing with the whole of the State, and that there were municipalities outside Perth where it would be a distinct advantage to have trees planted in the streets. A passage 31ft. wide would be ample in most cases, and if the traffic became so great as to necessitate the removal of the reserves, popular feeling would cause the councils to remove them.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY regretted members should look at the clause from one standpoint only, and that they should seek to compel all municipalities to ask for special Bills so as not to inconvenience Perth. The conveniences of other municipalities should not be subordinated to the convenience of Perth. No doubt the clause was ambiguous, but he was perfectly prepared to remedy it. He would substitute the words "each side" for "both sides," so that there would be no mistake; and that would insure 92 feet of roadway, irrespective of the tree reserve, or rather 30 feet for footpaths and 62 feet for vehicular traffic. That was liberal, and it practically put Perth and Fremantle out of court in attempting to create these tree reserves. It would only allow a 7 feet strip in St. George's Terrace, which probably would not be availed of. Members seemed to miss the point that this was not dependent on the whim of councils. The consent of the Government for the time being must be obtained beforehand, and the Government, at the request of the councils, might at any time revoke that permission. The question of the length of these reserves had been referred to, and he agreed that the length as it stood at present was somewhat extreme. It would be better to make it five chains. [HON. J. W. HACKETT: Three chains.] If mistakes had been made in Perth, it was not necessary and compulsory that they should be made elsewhere. The principal streets of Perth being, roughly speaking, a chain and a-half wide, he did not think Perth would be affected by the clause. Farthermore, supposing the Perth Council made a request, we had sufficient evidence in our Works Department and other departments to form an accurate estimate of what the traffic would be and for the Government to direct that the request should be refused. He hoped the Committee would pass the clause amended as he intended, and he was of opinion that any mistakes made in a place like Perth would be obviated. He moved an amendment—

That the words "both sides" in line 5 be struck out, and "each side" inserted in lieu.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: The clause was one of the most dangerous ever put into a Municipalities Bill. He did not think the streets of any municipality in this State which he had visited were wide enough for reserves as contemplated. The interests of the public were served and also the safety and beauty of appearance by clean streets, on each side of which foliage could be placed. Reserves like that where the unfortunate accident occurred were good neither for animals nor men; and he trusted the Committee would not let any corporation have the powers mentioned. If reserves were required, the proper course to pursue was to get them outside of the streets. He favoured protecting the freedom of the streets, both as related to roadways and footpaths, in regard to obstructions of this nature. One question would be that of the expense of widening streets, for if streets had to be widened, probably property would have to be bought at immense cost.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: Perhaps the Perth Council or some members of that council were the only persons who had raised this question. He had followed the deliberations of the municipal conferences, and did not remember that the

matter had been raised there at all. The powers already granted under Clause 9 were sufficiently large. Under Clause 9 the council could, in or upon any public place, street, road, or way in the municipality, without unduly obstructing the thoroughfare, plant trees. That clause protected the goldfields where the streets were two chains wide. In regard to streets 46ft. wide, if the width of the footpaths were deducted, it would leave a roadway of about 30ft. wide, and that was not sufficient for such reserves as those referred to. A width of 31ft. wide might be sufficient for the year 1905, but in 1910 we should be very sorry indeed if we granted any privileges of this kind.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In such a case the privilege could be revoked.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: Captain Laurie seemed to suggest that we interfered with the powers of municipal councils in this regard. At present we controlled municipal councils as to how they raised money, and if we had that power certainly we could exercise the power of saying how the money should be spent.

HON. J. W. HACKETT suggested that there should be a new clause.

Amendment put and passed.

HON. W. T. LOTON moved an amendment—

That "forty-six," in line 7, be struck out, and "fifty" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY was prepared to be still more generous. He moved an amendment—

That the word "ten" in line 8 be struck out and "three" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 11—Power to lease:

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE suggested that the word "three," in line 5, be struck out, and "ten" inserted in lieu. This proposal affected the goldfields towns which had town blocks, in regard to the leasing of their areas.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The term could be extended to 21 years with the Governor's sanction.

HON. C. A. PIESSE wished to refer to a danger which had arisen in connection with railway lands. He understood that lands owned by the council were not subject to taxation in any way. Recently some railway lands had been let by the Commissioner, and the roads board or whoever was the local authority in this instance found that it could not rate the occupiers. He wished to know whether if the council let these lands as provided in this clause, rates could be collected from those people the same as from ordinary occupiers. If not, it was the duty of this House to make such provision. We had an instance of a man carrying on a thriving business in the centre of a township, and they could not touch him with one solitary rate. He did not in any way help to bear the burden connected with the revenue of that town. He (Hon. C. A. Piesse) took it there was no provision under the principal Act which would enable the council to rate that land. The clause should be amended so as to permit the council to rate any man occupying land.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Before the new clauses on the Notice Paper were reached, progress would be reported. Meanwhile, inquiry would be made as to the hon. member's objection, and information furnished at the next sitting.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: Apparently the municipality could, with the consent of the Governor-in-Council, which might mean the consent of a friendly Ministry, let land on lease for 999 years. Why should power to give such a lease of a reserve be granted to a municipality or a Ministry?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In 999 cases out of 1,000, reserves granted to municipalities were granted for certain purposes only. Surely no Government would consent to reserves being leased for any other purposes.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: What was the purpose of the Perth Commonage?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Of that the City Council had the fee simple, and could, with the consent of the Governor-in-Council, sell the land, under Section 202 of the parent Act. Subject to that consent, a municipality could sell any land purchased from any person or acquired from His Majesty.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: Would not this be a good opportunity for repealing that section?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. Municipalities should have power to put their properties to the best possible use.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 12—Council may enter into bond for securing duty on goods in Customs warehouse:

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The clause referred practically to the bonded store at Kalgoorlie, and would enable the Kalgoorlie Council to execute any bond required for securing to the Commonwealth the payment of duty on goods lodged in the store. Hitherto such guarantee had been given by Hon. R. D. McKenzie, Mr. Keenan, member for the district in the Lower House, and another gentleman. He (Mr. Brimage) would ask the Minister to add to the clause so as to permit the council to enter into a bond for securing the payment of freight to the Commissioner of Railways on goods brought over-sea. The goods would remain in bond till duties and freights were paid. He would put the amendment on the Notice Paper.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 23 minutes past 6 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 8th December, 1905.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2·30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS—SEE WAH & CO., REGISTRATION.

MR. J. B. HOLMAN (Murchison) gave notice that at the next sitting he would move that all papers relating to See Wah & Co. be laid on the table of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND LABOUR (Hon. J. S. Hicks): In the course of a recent debate, the Premier promised to lay these papers on the table. He (the Minister) now tabled them accordingly.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

QUESTION—UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT LANDS.

MR. PRICE asked the Premier: 1, In what municipalities was land granted for University endowment purposes? 2, Have the trustees of the endowment fund profitably dealt with any lands so granted in the various municipalities?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Subiaco, Claremont, and North Fremantle. 2, Up to the present the trustees have had little or no opportunity to profitably deal with the lands granted. The Government, however, is assured that the trustees are fully alive to their responsibilities in this direction.

HORSE-RACING, PREVALENCE.
SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. A. J. WILSON brought up the report of the select committee.

Report received, read, and ordered to be printed.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES REDEDICATION (No. 2).

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, and read a first time,