

of replying, or that, in a case like this, the opportunity of a reply is not allowed until the use for that reply has passed away. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House any longer. I am sorry the House has, for the second time, divided on this question, with a regrettable result; but I hope that before the session is over the House may see the folly of its ways, and be converted and regenerated on this subject.

Question—that the motion as amended be adopted—put, and a division taken with the following result :—

Ayes	23
Noes	9

Majority for ... 14

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Connor	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Doherty	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Oats
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Reid
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Reside
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Kingsmill	Mr. Jacoby (Teller).
Mr. Leake	
Mr. Nanson	
Mr. O'Connor	
Mr. Phillips	
Mr. Piesse	
Mr. Pigott	
Mr. Quinlan	
Mr. Rason	
Mr. Smith	
Mr. Thomas	
Mr. Throssell	
Mr. Wilson	
Mr. Yelverton	
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	

Motion as amended thus passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.55 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 3rd September, 1901.

Petition : E.C. Church Lands Act, to Amend—Papers presented—Standing Orders, as to Amendment—Dog Act Amendment Bill, second reading (moved)—Assent to Bill—Land Act Amendment Bill, second reading (moved)—Bush Fires Bill, second reading (moved)—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION—R.C. CHURCH LANDS ACT, TO AMEND.

HON. R. S. HAYNES presented a petition from the Right Rev. W. B. Kelly, Roman Catholic Bishop of Geraldton, praying for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Ordinance 22 Vict., No. 4, and the Roman Catholic Church Lands Act 1895; and to empower the Bishop for the time being of each diocese of the Roman Catholic Church to exercise, in respect of the lands within his diocese, the powers granted by the said Act.

Petition received and read.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, Regulations and general instructions issued to the police force from the 20th to the 25th July last. 2, Regulations for the hours of attendance of public officers, under the Public Service Act 1900.

JOINT STANDING ORDERS, AS TO AMENDMENT.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (HON. C. Sommers) brought up the report of the Select Committee on proposed amendment of joint Standing Orders.

Report received and read, recommending that the amendment adopted by the Legislative Assembly be not concurred in.

DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): In moving the second reading of this Bill I need not say much. For some time the amendments now proposed have been asked for, and they

are, I believe, the outcome of several conferences.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Only two years ago we amended the Act.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I can assure hon. members that the present Act does not at all meet the difficulty. Not only in the country districts are there numbers of mangy curs running about destroying sheep, worrying cattle, and endangering pedestrians and others, but in the towns and suburbs, both here on the coast and on the goldfields, I assure hon. members that the dog pest is a serious nuisance. We have instances here in Perth of people, seeing there is no other redress, having taken the most extraordinary and unjustifiable course of administering poison to dogs in order to draw attention to the desirableness of passing an Act which will to some extent mitigate the nuisance. This has also happened on the goldfields. Only recently, I have learned from telegrams that in some of the towns from 40 to 100 dogs have been found dead in the morning.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: An act of blackguardism.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think it is the uprising of an angry and disgusted people. They felt that some strong and active measure was necessary to direct attention to this nuisance, and although I cannot agree with them in the course they have taken, still I hope it will show hon. members, if they need any farther showing, that something is necessary to be done. Clause 1 deals with the title. Clause 2 is a very necessary addition to the principal Act. It is now a matter of impossibility to determine by a dog's appearance whether he is or is not registered; and, consequently, large numbers of animals escape registration every year through the lack of some such provision. By insisting on every dog wearing a collar with the name of the owner inscribed thereon, there will be no difficulty in reaching the owner. Clause 2 provides for that. Clause 3 provides that the person registering a dog shall receive a metal disc on which shall be inscribed the registration number, the name of the district, and the date of registration. This will prevent a person from using the same disc for more than one year, the discs for each year being different in size and in other respects.

Clause 4 provides for the discs being suspended to the collars worn by the dogs, so that anyone can see at a glance whether or not a dog is registered. Clause 5 provides for the destruction of unregistered dogs, and I feel sure, from the experience I have had in a town infested with dogs, that this clause is very necessary. It provides that such animals shall be killed.

HON. G. RANDELL: What is the difference between "killed" and "destroyed"?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Clause 6 provides that the Act shall come into force on the 31st December, 1901. I commend this Bill to hon. members' consideration, and move that it be read a second time.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South): As a rule, much fun is made out of these Dog Bills; but I can assure hon. members that this is one of the most important subjects we have to deal with to-day. It directly affects the price of meat, and the price of everything else.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Of sausage-meat.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The useless tame dog that is kept to be a curse to the selector almost outnumbers the useful animals.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The Bill will not prevent people from keeping tame dogs.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: This matter should be looked into, and handled in a most serious manner.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Are you speaking of "tinned dog"?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: To my mind, the difficulty will not be met by this Bill, which does not go far enough. We shall have to go a stage farther, and to adopt, in dealing with dogs, the same cautious measures we take with our stock; in fact, we shall have to go in for heavy taxation, or for unsexing the male dog; otherwise we shall always have this trouble. According to the Stock Act, an entire horse is not allowed to roam about, under a penalty of £6; neither is a bull allowed to roam about, under a similar penalty; but we allow useless curs to run about the streets at their own sweet will, and at times there are disgraceful scenes in the streets in consequence. We shall have to go in for the unsexing of male dogs to do away with the trouble.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Do you intend moving that as an amendment?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: There is nothing more in the unsexing of a dog than there is in the unsexing of a horse. I suppose the hon. member would sooner see the disgraceful scenes which we sometimes witness in our streets than legislate in this matter. I hope the Minister will not go on with the various stages of the Bill to-day, but will allow the measure to be fully considered. Last night, as I was travelling down the line, at Brookton I was told by a gentleman that twenty of his sheep had been killed in one night by a so-called tame dog.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The owner is liable.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: In the Bunbury district something similar occurred, and Mr. Lukin told me of an incident in which he was successful in destroying a couple of dogs in his district; but I mention that as being an unusual occurrence.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How will the putting of a disc around a dog's neck remedy all this?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: If you adopt drastic steps you will prevent useless curs being kept. The Government pay 10s. a tail for the destruction of wild dogs, but on the other hand allow the breeding of a lot of mangy curs from which the State must suffer. I do not disagree with the Bill as far as it goes, but I hope the farther consideration of the measure will be allowed to stand over so that we may look into the matter.

HON. H. LUKIN (East): This is really a matter which should not be treated lightly. The loss to the State annually by tame dogs is something enormous, more than many members may think, and the trouble is increasing. Our country is getting occupied by small settlers getting closer together in the different districts: all of them keep a dog or two—useless dogs mostly. If land settlement is to progress satisfactorily, those taking up land must keep a few sheep. Let me instance the case of a man who has 50 or 100 ewes: he gets up some morning to find that half of them have been killed by some curs. I have known similar instances in my own district. I heard of one the other day: it was the case of a man who had 100 sheep; he got up one morning to find that 25 of his sheep had been killed.

The dogs in the country districts are increasing. Everybody keeps a cur or two, and the fox terriers and dogs of that description are the worst kind of dogs to kill sheep.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: How will you stop them?

HON. H. LUKIN: I do not care whether the dog has to wear a disc or a metal collar with the owner's name engraved thereon. When a dog is found running about the country killing sheep, and that dog has a disc around its neck, it is easy to find out the name of the owner; and if it is possible to find out to whom the dog belongs, the person whose sheep have been destroyed has a certain remedy. If a man finds a couple of dogs running about his paddock in the morning and he discovers that a number of sheep have been killed, the owner of the dog will disown the animal. Settlers have become so exasperated that they lay poison and kill not only dogs, but fowls, etcetera. I hope the House, for the sake of the annual loss, will for once treat the matter seriously, and if this particular Bill which has been brought before the House be not passed, some amendment should be drafted to mitigate the evil from which the settlers in the country are suffering.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): I must say that I do not like these short amendments to Acts, and unless the amendments are fully explained, one is inclined to agree to them, subsequently to find out that a mistake has been made. One should have time to look through the original Act to see how the amendment works out. In passing these Bills one does not see that they present any difficulty, but afterwards in looking into the matter it is found that we have practically sold our birthright. I especially refer to one or two Acts which have been passed and on which I have said nothing, but afterwards I have found out that a great deal of harm has been done. These Bills appear to be little hornets' nests. The Hon. C. A. Piesse is so violently antagonistic to dogs that at some time he must have been bitten by a mad dog. When the hon. member says that the passing of this Bill will lower the price of meat, of course his argument is unanswerable. Some persons think it right to have a dog for protection. Those who live in the bush, where nobody goes, of

course do not want dogs. People with common sense do not go there. You do not go to a goat's house for wool. But I am speaking of persons who live in large towns, where it is found absolutely necessary to have a dog for the protection of one's goods and fowls, and probably for the protection of the occupants of the house.

HON. H. LUKIN: You would not object to a dog wearing a disc?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have no objection to a dog wearing a disc, but the Bill does not meet the case at all. We will say that there are within the State some 50,000 dogs. Of this number 30,000 or 40,000 are in the towns where they can do no damage, and 10,000 or 5,000 of these dogs are in the country and do all the damage; but because 5,000 dogs do damage in the country, the owners of the other dogs are to be penalised by every dog having to wear a collar on which is legibly inscribed the name of the owner. That means half a guinea every time a person moves his residence, because the inscription on the the collar will have to be altered. We shall find that the engravers will make a little "corner," because we know that these things are done. The newspapers do it in reference to the advertisements for hotel licenses—they charge about six times as much as they otherwise would. As soon as it is made compulsory on people to do certain things, up will go the price.

HON. J. M. SPEED: It does not say in the Act that this disc has to be found by the owner. The registration officer has to do that.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It says that every dog must wear a collar on which is legibly inscribed the name of the owner.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: And you have to get that altered every year.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes; every year; Also if the dog loses the collar. There are numbers of very valuable dogs about the city. I should be very sorry to lose the dog I have, but if it were a nuisance to anybody in the bush I would destroy it. But my dog does not go out into the bush. The Bill may be very well drafted. Instructions are given to the draughtsman as to what is required. The draughtsman simply strings a few words together and says "There you have your amend-

ment," but he does not know the effect of the amendment on the original Act. An endeavour was made to pass a similar Bill through the House some time ago, and I should like to know what has occurred since then to alter matters.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Several men have been killed.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Several men?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. One at Fremantle.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Will the wearing of a disc alter that?

HON. H. LUKIN: The previous measure was not thrown out on that point, but on another question.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There will be a great objection to the collar and the disc, and I hope members will oppose any attempt to impose on persons living in the towns an unnecessary expense, because this amendment will mean the paying of a guinea a year by the owner of a dog.

HON. D. MCKAY: It will destroy the curs in the country.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It will not, because at the present time a very valuable dog may be poisoned. Some dogs are worth from £15 to £50. If a valuable dog has not a metal disc around its neck it is taken to be unregistered, and what is to prevent my taking the collar off a dog, and Bill Sykes taking the dog away? This Bill requires to be very carefully handled. I hope this measure will be altered.

HON. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I quite sympathise with the remarks which have fallen from hon. members with regard to the damage which has been done to stock. I have known of very valuable imported sheep being killed by dogs, and the owners of those dogs have been well known. Dogs have been left to roam at their own fond will—to go out and come in when they like. We can never make dogs moral by Act of Parliament. A suggestion has been made that this Bill should not refer to dogs in towns. I have known of cases in which valuable dogs have left the towns and gone into the country, where there is a nice lot of sheep in a paddock, and kill them wholesale. The point is, will or will not that disc prevent their so doing? I unhesitatingly say it will not prevent them; and while I should willingly support any measure

that would remedy this evil, I fail to see what this Bill will do to alleviate it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It will lower the price of beef.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: The course I should adopt, if I got within gunshot of such dogs, would be to shoot them; and I should poison them if they were on my own property. While I say I would support any measure which would remove this evil, I cannot see this Bill will do so; therefore I am not prepared to support it in its present form.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East): I suggest that a proper Bill be brought in for amending the whole of the Dog Act. I think the Act is in a most disgraceful condition. One thing in particular came under my notice to-day, namely, that an unregistered dog when seized must be destroyed. It is not possible for the man who seizes the dog to give it away to any person, no matter how valuable the dog may be. I think a Bill ought to be brought in to empower municipalities and roads boards, if necessary, to establish some system of pounds in which unregistered dogs, when seized, may be placed, and then sold to defray expenses, so that owners need not necessarily lose their dogs. Again, settlers must be put to great trouble through dogs killing sheep, and power should be given them to destroy such dogs.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You can destroy them on your own land.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: And a farther clause should be inserted in the Act making those who can be proved to be the owners of dogs responsible for damage done. That section is in the Victorian Act; and a heavy penalty is enforced against the owner of a dog which can be proved to have done damage to cattle or other live stock. I am in favour of some such suggestion as appears in the Bill, that all dogs should have some distinguishing mark, and should be registered; for in that case the difficulty can always be met. Mr. Haynes has said there is nothing to prevent a person removing a collar. The only way to prevent that is by imposing a severe penalty in the Act.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: And there is no penalty.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: No; but my object is to suggest that a little time be

allowed for the consideration of this Bill before we go into Committee, because I should like to introduce a number of amendments to meet some of the points of which I have spoken; but I approve of the principle of the Bill, that dogs should have distinguishing marks of registration, to enable municipalities, roads boards, inspectors, and others to be appointed under some amending Act, to distinguish between registered and unregistered dogs.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South): I believe that at present the municipalities have a right to register dogs. I know that in the Kalgoorlie district our dogs have to be registered, and have to wear distinguishing discs. I think that is the right way to keep dogs under. No doubt mongrels parading about the streets are a great danger to children and other pedestrians; moreover, I think some very strong restrictions should be put on sluts on heat. I strongly object to seeing the number of mongrel female dogs running about the streets every day, and the disgusting scenes we so often witness. Strong restrictions should be imposed, and owners compelled to keep these sluts inside their yards. I will support any measure that will have for its object the destroying of useless dogs.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East): For one or two reasons, I shall support the Bill before the House; chiefly because at the present time, if one has sheep destroyed in the country, and succeeds in poisoning or shooting a dog, one has no clue whatever to the owner of the dog which has done the mischief. If every dog has to wear a disc, that will act as a deterrent to persons in the habit of allowing dogs which have a proclivity for killing sheep and committing other depredations to be left at large. Anything that will tend to prevent a nuisance such as the dogs are in the country must be of good service to the State; and although it may be contained in a small amending Bill, which seems at first glance unimportant, that feature alone is sufficient to warrant the House in passing it into law; because later on, even if we have a dozen of these amending Acts, if they are all serviceable they can be consolidated and confirmed, thus making one useful Act. Probably we do not possess to-day the whole wisdom of the world in this House. All

we can do is to make an impression on the laws of the State with such wisdom as we do possess. Laws will always be coming up for amendment; and if we neglect our duty through some idiosyncrasy with regard to the nonpassing of small measures like this, we are doing an injustice to certain people in the country and in the towns also. I believe Mr. Haynes knows something about McGuire's bull pup and Maloney's fenian cat; but he does not possess the whole of the wisdom of this House.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: How can I, when you are here?

HON. W. MALEY: The hon. member seems to think that discs attached to dogs in towns may not have the same value as a similar system in the country. But the hon. member as a lawyer will know it is very difficult to prove the ownership of a dog which happens to bite him in the street, even if he be successful in killing it; so, if the proviso act as a deterrent in the country, it will do so in the towns, and will tend to reduce the number of dangerous mongrels. I think that alone is a sufficient reason for supporting the Bill.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I shall support this Bill, which I think is a very important measure. It will enable anyone, in any circumstances, to find out the owner of any dog by which damage has been done. I do not believe in the indiscriminate destruction of dogs. I am fond of dogs, and I think a good faithful dog ought to be protected; but the collar will be a protection to the dog, and also to the owner of stock, for people can then find out whose dog it was that did the damage. I do not see the necessity of having a disc. I think it would be sufficient if the owner's name were engraved on the collar.

HON. R. G. BURGESS (East): We are always having amendments of this Dog Act brought before the House. I suppose a new Parliament must do something in the way of introducing new measures; but, for myself, I cannot see much use in supporting this Bill. If every dog found in a paddock carried a disc such as is advocated, it would be all very well; but hon. members who have spoken know perhaps a great deal more than I do—or I will give them the benefit of the doubt—and they know that

nearly all the depredations of dogs are done at night; and I, perhaps, know as much of these matters as any man in the country.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Have you dogs of your own?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I have. There is only one way to deal with dogs which commit depredations; and that is by poison. Though the dog have a disc, he comes at night and kills our sheep; the dog is gone in the morning, and of what use is the disc? For years past I and my neighbours have been annoyed by such ravages; but how often have we caught a dog? For the last ten years we have never caught a dog killing a sheep. To do so, you would have to watch all night. Dogs come from the towns at night, kill sheep, and disappear ere morning. Even if you poison the dog, that is no proof that the dog killed the sheep, because the killing was done at night. Such Acts are of very little use. Another thing. My friend on my right (Mr. Dempster) was such an active man in his young days that he never kept a dog: he would run down a sheep himself first. But other men of experience know that in large paddocks we should not get our sheep together at all without dogs. I have always had to keep five or six dogs in one part and another of my property; and why should such men as myself have to go to the expense of getting collars for these dogs, and of having these discs reregistered and paid for every year? Why should we have to go to all this expense, when we know very well that we shall not be in any way benefited? If it would benefit us, I would not mind paying these extra charges; but those who use the dogs have to pay for all these extras without getting any benefit. You have to catch a dog first before you can do anything with him; and in 99 cases out of 100 you cannot catch the dog at all, disc or no disc.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: True. You cannot get him now.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Mr. Jenkins suggested that if this Bill be passed, we can bring in certain amendments at a future date; but I hope we will consider it pretty well before we pass it, because it is no use bringing forward these little amendments every year.

People are always complaining that these different Acts are constantly being added to; and we have to go back 20 or 30 years to look up such amendments, in order to find out what is the law. We have heard this practice condemned every year in both Houses of Parliament; yet it is going on worse than ever. We have a whole lot of Bills before us this year, and I do not think any of them is very creditable. They are apparently brought in to give us something to do; but I do not see that they are much credit to whosoever has introduced them. Even if we have nothing else to do, I do not see why we should pass a lot of little amendments like this.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Bring in one Bill.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: True. It is not two years since this very amendment was fought out here; and some hon. members who are now fully determined about it fought it out then: they have had the whole of the House against them: and I think they will have the majority against them now if an attempt be made to force the Bill through at this stage. If it be held over for farther consideration, and the various statutes be consolidated in one Act, some good may be done; but I shall not support this Bill unless I find I have every other country member against me. I am sure it will not stop the killing of sheep. As has been pointed out by Mr. Clarke, even if we put a collar on a dog, it will not stop killing sheep, nor will it kill them by daylight. Dogs will continue to go out at night, and in the morning will be pretty far away from the scenes of their depredations. We can poison the dogs now, and that is the best way to get rid of them. That is what I am doing. I have often to poison my own dogs and buy others; because settlers have to lay poison to kill native dogs, and in doing so they often kill their own dogs. Settlers have to risk that. Some members wish to impose an additional tax on settlers, but I hope members will look into the Bill before they finally deal with this subject. There is too much legislation in the State, and we are adding to it every year by making amendments to every Act. I shall not support the Bill at present. If it were a consolidating measure I should support it, but I cannot support this amendment.

HON. E. McLARTY (South-West): It is not my intention to support this Bill, because I do not think that, because a dog has a collar or a disc around its neck, that will be any benefit to the settlers. It would give them a great deal of trouble and mean additional expense. I believe, with the Hon. A. G. Jenkins, that the Dog Act requires a great many amendments. Members are quite right when they say that settlers' sheep are being killed in the paddocks. Settlers are not allowed to lay poison without posting notices and advertising and doing a lot of other things.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: But you do not always give notice?

HON. E. McLARTY: I do not, and I do not intend to: it appears to be absolute nonsense. If my sheep are killed I will very soon try and catch the dogs which killed them. The other morning I saw two dogs eating one of my sheep while that sheep was alive; one dog was gnawing at the shoulder and the other at the leg of the sheep.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Where did you bury those dogs?

HON. E. McLARTY: I poisoned the sheep to put it out of its misery, and then I poisoned the carcass and watched it in the day time. The next day I got one of the culprits: it was a large kangaroo dog. After that a person in the district had his dog poisoned, and he thought that I had poisoned it. He came to me and asked if I had laid poison for dogs and if I had posted notices, but I told him that I had not laid poison. But I have no hesitation in saying that, notwithstanding the Act, if I found my sheep being killed by neighbours' dogs, I should do what I think is right and just. I think the present Act is a farce in requiring a man to put up notices, because so soon as you put up a notice your neighbour will chain up his dog and prevent the animal getting at the poison. There is something in the remark made by the Hon. C. A. Piesse as to the price of meat. When a man has only 100 ewes, and 25 of them get killed in one night, it is a great thing to that man, and this kind of thing is going on all over the country; therefore it must have some effect on the price of meat. We must have some strict measure enacted which will allow people to destroy dogs which

go about doing so much damage. I do not agree with the Hon. R. S. Haynes that it is the 5,000 dogs in the country, and not the 30,000 dogs in the towns, which do all the damage, for I know many instances of dogs travelling for miles.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But there are no sheep about Perth.

HON. E. McLARTY: Very frequently dogs travel long distances to kill sheep in the country: a lot of damage is done by dogs from the towns. I shall oppose the Bill, although I would like to see an amendment of the present Act, but I think the House should enact some measure which is reasonable. The original Act is never carried out: no one posts notices if he lose sheep.

On motion by HON. A. JAMESON (Minister), debate adjourned until the next Tuesday.

ASSENT TO LOAN BILL.

Message received from His Excellency the Governor, and read, assenting to Loan Bill (£2,600,000).

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said: This is a very important Bill, and I thoroughly realise this in introducing it to the notice of hon. members. I am sure I shall have the assistance of the House in considering this measure, which is brought forward for the purpose of carrying out the requirements of the community. In this measure I am sure I shall have the assistance of the Hon. R. G. Burges, and I shall endeavour to make clear to him, as well as to other hon. members, the importance of the amendments which it is proposed to make to the Land Act. Unfortunately it is necessary to introduce amendments year by year, and I presume this always will be necessary where the conditions of land settlement go on increasing and developing. Fresh cases are brought under the notice of the Government by persons who have taken up land, and it is necessary to make improvements or add to the liberal land laws which now exist. In bringing down this Bill I do so on the recommendation

of officers of the department, in accordance with the requirements of a great number of settlers, and partly from the experience I have gained in the office I now occupy, and these amendments have been proved to me to be necessary. I will just briefly touch on the various clauses as I go through the Bill and endeavour to give some reasons for the amendments; but in Committee I shall have a good deal more to say on the clauses as they are being discussed. Clause 1 deals with the title. Clause 2, Sub-clause a., contains an amendment to the definition of the word "fence," which has the effect of making a fence capable of resisting the trespass of large stock a fence within the meaning of the Act of 1899. Sections 55 and 56 provide that the fence erected shall be such a one as will resist great and small stock, that is cattle and sheep. It has been found in many instances where sheep are not kept that it is a hardship to make settlers erect a sheep-proof fence, and it is intended to allow settlers to erect a cattle-proof fence only, or a sheep-proof fence, just as they may desire. By doing this we shall be conferring a boon on many settlers and others, and the amendment is very necessary in many districts.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Do you think the amendment will carry out what you intend?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think it will.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: You only alter one word.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Act says:

"Fence" means any substantial fence, not being a brush fence, proved to the satisfaction of the Minister to be sufficient to resist the trespass of great and small stock, including sheep, but not including pigs or goats.

That means a fence which will prevent great or small stock getting through.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The word "or" will not make the difference.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think it will. At any rate, the intention of the amendment is to enable a settler to erect either a cattle-proof or a sheep-proof fence, instead of making it compulsory to erect a fence which will resist the trespass of great and small stock. Sub-clause b. amends Section 5 of the principal Act in such a manner as to

allow the Governor to grant land in fee simple for other lands in the State, such as poison land or conditionally purchased land. It will bring the Act into line with a similar section of the South Australian Act. In many cases, particularly on the goldfields, residence areas are granted, not in fee simple; but it has been found necessary for the Government to make exchanges, and the Act at present states that an exchange of land can only be made in fee simple for land already held in fee simple. In the past these exchanges have been made illegally, and Sub-clause b. will make legal now what was before illegally done. It is absolutely necessary to have this provision. A case in point occurs in regard to the Coolgardie water supply catchment area. There has been reserved a large area to safeguard the water from pollution, and it has been deemed desirable that many poison leases shall be resumed. Already the Government have been approached, not only by leaseholders of poisoned land, but others who are willing to exchange land and are willing to take fee simple lands in other portions of the State. It is desirable that power should be given to the Minister to make these exchanges wherever it is in the public interest. It is a big power to give any Minister, but it is absolutely necessary in the conduct of the affairs of the State to have power to exchange land in the way suggested.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: With the consent of the Governor?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Of course.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The Minister has that already.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not already.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: In fee simple he has.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes; but not to exchange for conditionally purchased land and poison leases or land held under any similar title. Sub-clause c. contains an amendment of considerable importance. It is to add the words of Section 55 of the Act: "provided that in no case shall the annual instalment of purchase money be less than one pound." This amendment is considered desirable for the granting of leases in regard to small areas. I may mention it

is not proposed to make an additional charge for rent when additional money is paid, and it does not increase the price of the land. It is simply an office suggestion, and I hope hon. members will see their way to agree to it. It is not a very important amendment, but it will effect a considerable saving in office work. Sub-clause d. is an amendment to Section 68 of the Act. The words "three hundred" are substituted for the words "one thousand." The section deals with grazing leases, and it says:—

The minimum area in either class shall be one thousand acres, but if the land applied for is so shut in by other holdings as not to contain the minimum area aforesaid, or for any other special reason, the Governor may approve of the issue of a lease of a lesser area.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: And allow them to go anywhere?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I hope not. This amendment has been asked for by a great many settlers, and it will be advantageous in making it possible to deal with small pieces of second and third class land; and the minimum of a grazing lease will be 300 acres. The present Act provides that unless small pieces of land are enclosed, the Minister cannot grant any grazing lease under 1,000 acres. But this compels them very often to take up more land than they need; and I think 300 acres is a very reasonable area. There are plenty of men, especially in the South-West division, who have small selections of 200 and 300 acres, or even less; and they would be glad to swell out their properties and take up an additional few hundred acres of second or third class land, with the idea of increasing their stock, without paying the price now fixed of 10s. per acre. Judging by the requests made from almost all parts of the settled districts of the State, I think this provision will commend itself. Clause 2 repeals Sections 69 and 72 of the principal Act, which deal with pastoral lessees' rights to grazing leases, and with the conditional purchase of poison lands. The delay occasioned by the present provision for three months' notice to the pastoralist has caused very great irritation and annoyance. Since 1898 pastoralists have had the privilege of taking up such lands. Hon. members know that a selector, wishing to take up a piece of land, first

makes application. When he does so, three months' notice has to be sent to the pastoralist occupying that run, advising him of the intention of, say, John Brown to select; and the pastoralist is given a three months' option of taking up the land. A fortnight probably elapses before the pastoralist gets the notice; and generally he waits until the last day before the expiry of the notice, and then takes up the land; and by the time John Brown is notified of the pastoralist's having done so, four months have elapsed.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: We have to wait a long time now.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am told that in the past the selector had to wait five or six months in order to get his answer; and then he had to go through the same process again, probably with the same result.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Whom do you term a pastoralist? A "jackeroo"?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: A man who can take up a run by paying £1 for every 1,000 acres. But the existing law is unjust. Supposing the pastoralist takes up 15,000 acres, he pays at the rate of £15 per annum. He may pay £7 10s., a half year's rent; and the privileges of a squatter are at once conferred upon him, for he has a right to select 3,000 acres, against an ordinary selector's 1,000. We do not intend to take that privilege away from him; but we must remember that, for the sake of his £7 10s., that squatter can keep anyone off his selection for six months. He must receive three months' warning intimating to him that John Brown desires to select upon that lease; and for that paltry payment of £7 10s. the squatter may keep that run locked up, and have the right to select 3,000 acres of it as against an ordinary selector's 1,000. I think great good will be done by repealing those sections. I do not see there is any special need for this protection to the squatter. Of course we all look upon him as a pioneer; he has certain privileges; but as closer settlement progresses, it is recognised throughout the Australian States that the squatter must move back, or put up with the consequences. He has his compensation for improvements; he knows the conditions upon which he takes up his lease; and I think in doing away with this three months'

notice, which practically means five and sometimes six months, a great increase of settlement will be promoted.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: All this applies to the South-West land division only.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Sub-clause f. adds to Section 78 of the principal Act the following proviso:—

Provided that if the selector holds any lands under conditional purchase under Part V. of this Act, within twenty miles of his homestead farm, then residence and improvements on such lands shall be a sufficient compliance with the conditions of residence and improvement required on the homestead farm but such improvements must be in addition to those required by Part V. on the conditional purchase lands.

I think hon. members will agree that this is a necessary clause. The idea is that a man may hold a homestead farm along side his conditional purchase area, and may find for various reasons that the homestead allotment is not desirable for building purposes; and it is with the object of giving him the option of erecting his improvements on his conditional purchase land that this sub-clause has been provided. I know of many instances in which there is on the conditional purchase area a nice hill, or better water, or land more suitable for a garden; and the idea is to allow the selector to put those improvements on the conditional purchase area, even though it may be as far as 30 miles away from his homestead farm. I hon. members think 30 miles too far, an amendment, even down to "adjoining," would suit the case.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Such men cannot always get the land adjoining.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: They cannot. I think this is a very desirable suggestion. This brings us to Clause 3. Section 152 of the principal Act provides for special leases being granted for certain purposes. The new clause is drawn on the lines of a similar section in the Victorian Act. Hon. members will see the details of the various purposes for which these leases may be granted. They are not to exceed 25 acres, except in the case of leases for guano or other manure or for the collection and manufacture of salt. It has been found necessary for the working of the department that these new regulations should come into force. The leases are obtainable for a short time, not exceeding 21 years, and the

rea is 25 acres. These provisions as to rea do not, however, apply to leases for guano and salt

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Is there any limit to the guano and salt leases?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; those are exceptions.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Then any quantity of land may be granted for any time for guano or for salt?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is so. The clause farther states:—

Provided that in all cases where it is proposed to grant a lease for a longer term than ten years, notice of the application for such lease and of the purpose and term for which it is proposed to be granted shall be published in four consecutive ordinary numbers of the *Gazette*, at least one month before the grant of such lease.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In case of the granting of more than 25 acres, the fact should be published in the *Gazette*.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is no objection to that. Probably the hon. member will bring that up in Committee, and any such suggestion will be appreciated. That brings us to Clause 6. I had intended to move to strike out of the first line, "the Resident Magistrate of the district shall not act as umpire." The Minister has power to resume land; and it is not always convenient that the Resident Magistrate should be the umpire. It sometimes happens that in very large undertakings it might be desirable to have an umpire with a greater knowledge of the matter in hand than is possessed by the Resident Magistrate. The Resident Magistrate might have very little experience; and at present we are pinned down to the Resident Magistrate in the case of arbitration, and it is thought desirable that we should not be so restricted. That, of course, is only in the case where the Minister resumes the land. The provision does not affect the ordinary selector. The umpire will have all the rights, powers, and privileges which would be possessed by the Resident Magistrate under the principal Act. Clause 5 makes provision for dealing with second and third class land, which may be disposed of, subject to the conditions of Sections 55, 56, or 57 of the principal Act, at a price less than 10s. per acre, to be fixed by the Governor in each case according to the classification of the land.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Is the Governor to fix the price at less than 10s. at his own option?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: At present the price of second-class land is fixed at 6s. 3d., and of third-class at 3s. 9d.; and it is not proposed to lower these prices. But in agricultural areas that have been set aside for closer settlement, many of which are patchy, it is not always possible to get a large space of first-class ground for agricultural uses, and the experience of the department is that all the best blocks in the agricultural area are selected, and often we are left with a lot of inferior land on our hands. The question is, what is to become of that inferior land? At present we have no power to dispose of it at less than 10s. per acre.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Nevertheless, that has been done.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not in agricultural areas.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I am certain of it; and the fact has been published in the *Gazette*, too, as I can show you from papers in my possession.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I take it we have at present no power to fix a lower price for that land; and if the clause be passed, it will give us that necessary power, and will enable us to dispose of these inferior lands to the great advantage of many settlers. Clause 6 gives the Governor power to close any road or reservation for a road which may have been surveyed or shown as a road on the plans of the department, but which has not been declared a Government road. At present there is no provision for getting rid of such roads, except by Act of Parliament. I believe a Bill comes down every year for the closing of certain streets, with a schedule of streets which it is desired to close; but, at present, once a road is shown upon a Government plan, the department have no power to close it. It is only desired to take advantage of the right to clear roads in cases where the roads have not been taken over by the board, and where they have not been declared.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: You ought to apply to the roads board before this is done.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It does not come under the roads board at

all. When a board is formed it takes over certain roads, and these roads cannot be closed except by Act of Parliament. On the old plan, in certain districts roads are shown which can be of no use. Roads may end abruptly probably at a precipice, or run into a boulder or some rocks, and it is impossible to continue these roads. The Government ought to have the right to close these roads without making any special appeal to Parliament for the right to close them. These roads, the officers declare, are useless, and are not in the interests of the public.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Does this apply to roads board districts?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It must do.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Minister says it does not.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Of course it must.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The clause says:

The Governor may, by proclamation in the *Gazette*, close any road or reservation for a road which may have been surveyed or shown as a road on any plan published by the Department of Lands and Surveys: Provided that such road is not within the limits of a municipality or townsite, and has not been declared a Government road or declared a road under the Roads Act 1888 or any amendment thereof.

Surely that gives ample protection.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: No.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member can discuss the question in Committee, but I tell him the amendment is absolutely necessary in the conduct of the affairs of the Lands Department. We have frequently found how unfortunate it is, and that it hampers the work. We have to go a round-about way in closing roads which were surveyed perhaps 20 or 30 years ago. I have just briefly referred to the clauses, and I commend them to the House. I propose that the Committee stage shall not be taken until next week.

On motion by Hon. C. A. PIESSE, debate adjourned until the next Tuesday.

BUSH FIRES BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, which has been found necessary and has been asked for by

many settlers. I have only to refer to the disastrous fires which have occurred during the last year, especially in the Avon district, to remind hon. member that the introduction of such an amendment is necessary. I thoroughly realise that no Act of Parliament will prevent bush fires, but a Bill like this is necessary. It is desirable to take every precaution to prevent recurrence of bush fires, such as we have had in the past. Members realise that there are unscrupulous men who, in the ordinary course of clearing their own land, are absolutely regardless of the danger to those surrounding them. Men may desire to clear bush land, and they do so at a time which will suit them best; but some persons are regardless of what harm may be done to their neighbours who have been saving grass which will attain a good height in a good season, but which becomes highly inflammable. Notwithstanding every precaution being taken to prevent this grass being destroyed, a neighbour in burning off may cause disaster, and perhaps ruin to an adjoining settler. I do not say that this Bill is perfect, and I ask hon. members to give their valuable assistance, when the matter is considered in Committee in making the Bill a good one. Any suggestions will be appreciated by me, and I have no doubt the measure will be appreciated by the settlers as a whole, if it will in any way diminish the danger which now threaten them. Clause 1 deals with the title, and Clause 2 with the date of the commencement of the Act. There is a slight mistake there, however, and I intend to move, when in Committee, that the Bill should come into force on the 1st November, 1901. Clause 3 repeals the present Act, so now we shall have a consolidating measure, instead of the numerous amendments which hon. members think are so objectionable. Clause 4 deals with the interpretation.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Does "bush" apply to grass on reserves?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I should say it applies everywhere.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: To private parks, such as the Queen's Park?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think it is possible the Bill would not apply in that case, as there are metal roads around that park; but there is no

Bill which will meet every case. I do not know that the measure will apply to municipalities.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It ought not to apply to municipalities.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is not intended that it should, but we can get over that. By Clause 5, the Governor declares the times of the year during which it shall be unlawful to set fire to bush within any district or part of the State mentioned in the notice. I notice that Sub-clauses 1 and 2 of this clause are the same as those in the present Act. Clause 6 provides a penalty for lighting fires wilfully or negligently within any district during the prohibited times, and the clause is similar to the present Act. Clause 7 provides:

No person shall burn any part of the bush at any time during the months of October, March, or April, unless—

- (a.) He has recently ploughed around the area to be burned a strip of land eight feet wide, nor unless
- (b.) He keeps at least four men in attendance to prevent such fire extending beyond the said area.

Every person acting contrary to this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding Fifty pounds.

This clause is taken from the South Australian Bush Fires Act of 1895, which allows burning during the prohibited times where precautions are taken; and it is thought desirable to allow persons to burn off, provided they take these precautions, during the preceding month and the month after the prohibited time. If a person wishes to burn scrub within this time he must take the necessary precautions. The owner of any land cannot burn off during the months of October, March, or April, unless he has ploughed around the area a strip of land eight feet wide or keeps four men in attendance to prevent the fire extending. A penalty of fifty pounds is provided by this clause.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: That applies to certain districts.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The following is a list of the prohibited times under the Bush Fires Act of 1885:—In the Victoria Magisterial District, from 1st November to 15th October; York and Toodyay, 1st November to 1st March; Williams and Katanning, 1st November

to 1st March; Swan, 1st November to 1st March. All the magisterial districts south of the Victoria district, and not enumerated, from 1st October to 1st March. This clause is taken from the South Australian Act, and the precautions have to be taken before the burning off can be started. If in the Williams district, for instance, a person wishes to burn off after the 1st March, fires might occur, and it is necessary that precautions should be taken by the ploughing of the strip of land eight feet wide, or having four men at least in attendance to prevent the spreading of the fire.

HON. C. A. PRESSE: Is it necessary to have the men present as well as to plough the strip of land?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: A settler must have the strip of land ploughed, or four men in attendance to prevent the spread of the fire. Clauses 8 and 9 are new. Clause 8 reads as follows:—

No person between the first of October and the 30th April in any year shall (in connection with any gun, rifle, pistol, or other firearm) carry or use any wadding made of paper, cotton, linen, or any other ignitable substance.

Every person acting contrary to this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding Ten pounds.

This is an addition to the present Act. It also is taken from the South Australian law, and I think will commend itself to hon. members. It is unlawful for any person to carry or use any wadding made of paper, cotton, or linen, or any other ignitable substance when out shooting, and persons are prevented from carrying firearms in close proximity to stacks. Clause 10 deals with the lighting of the fires. This clause is not in the present Act: it is taken from the South Australian Act of 1885, and a similar clause is also to be found in the Victorian law. It has been thought desirable to incorporate this provision in the present Bill.

HON. C. A. PRESSE: Is the distance the same?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes; the clause is copied exactly from the Act I have mentioned, so I understand.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Does this apply to the Northern pastoral districts as well as to the agricultural districts?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It applies to the whole State. Clause 11

deals with smoking near stacks, and this clause is not in the existing Act, but is taken from the South Australian Act: a similar provision is also in force in Victoria. Clause 12 deals with attempting to light or lighting fires with intent to do injury. This is taken from the South Australian Act. The clause deals also with the placing of matches or the placing of any inflammable material on property.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Stopping the importation of wax matches would do more good.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Clause 13 provides that the Act is not to affect "any right of action or other remedy at common law or otherwise which any person may have in respect of any loss or damage caused by any such fire as aforesaid." This proviso is embodied in the existing Act. We found it a good clause, and it has therefore been retained. Clause 14 is similar to that in the existing Act, and Clause 15 is an addition to the existing Act, being taken from the Act of South Australia.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That is the sugar of the plum.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: What about the Collie coal?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Collie coal can hardly be dealt with in an Act of Parliament; but we all hope that, as the industry develops, we shall get a better class of coal, as good as if not better than Newcastle coal.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: After we are ruined by bush fires.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is, I think, a matter of arrangement. The Railway Department, seeing the great losses some have suffered last year and the losses suffered by settlers through the use of the coal, may take steps to prevent its consumption during the summer months.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: "May!" They will continue to ignore us.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Well, the state of affairs in the Railway Department is now different from what it was on the previous occasion; consequently, some steps may be taken to remedy the mischief, and I think I can guarantee a change for the better. I believe extra precautions will be taken during the summer months, so that the risks to be run may be as few as

possible. I think the expense the Government have already incurred in respect of bush fires should commend this Bill to hon. members, and I trust we shall be able to improve it, and to make it of assistance to settlers.

HON. R. G. BURGESS (East): This Bill is badly wanted. Bush fires are the cause of endless trouble, and people causing them receive very little punishment. According to my experience, the clauses of this Bill which are copied from the South Australian Act are rather too strict for the present situation of this country. I should like to see the Act as strict as it can be; but I am sure some of the clauses will not work in this State at the present time; and especially do I refer to Clause 7. I am sure there will be a general outcry if that clause pass as it now stands, because we know that in the South-West and elsewhere there is a large amount of clearing going on; and people know they can get the work done much more cheaply in the dry than in the wet months. We must not stop the progress of settlement by introducing a clause not applicable to this State, though desirable in South Australia, where almost all the country is improved. Clause 7 will, I am sure, require amendment, if it should not be almost entirely struck out. Clause 10 also will require some amendment:—

No person shall light or use any fire in the open, or for the purpose of cooking, camping, or for any other purpose, without a space of ground around the same of the radius of ten feet at least having been previously cleared of all grass, bushes, and leaves, or branches of trees.

How is a man to boil a billy of tea? At that rate, he would have to carry a spade with him, and the roads board would have to clear a large space at each watering-place, so that men travelling through the district might light fires.

HON. C. A. PRESSE: Teamsters carry spades with them.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: But hundreds of men carry swags only, and no spades. Hundreds of such men are walking through the country every day, and it would be absurd to expect men looking for work to clear 10 feet of ground before lighting a fire. It is unreasonable and impossible to expect them to do so. Regarding Clause 11, I do not know whether it is the law in South Australia;

but I am sure it is absurd to think it could be carried out here. It reads:—

Every person who shall, at any time during the months of October, November, December, January, February, March, and April, smoke any pipe, cigar, cigarette, or other substance within twenty yards of any stable, or of any rick, stack, or field of hay—

Just fancy men being prevented from smoking in a field containing three or four acres of hay! There is very little risk there. Someone suggested that a man wanting to smoke be sent out of the field.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Let him smoke, if he have a cover on his pipe.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I think this is carrying matters too far altogether, that a man should have to go out of his field to smoke his pipe.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: Let him use a tin cover.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It is useless passing such unreasonable regulations. I am sure some hon. members who support this clause would themselves be the greatest sinners. I have seen not only workmen, but owners cutting up hay, who will smoke in spite of every regulation. I have seen them sitting over the bags of chaff and smoking as they sewed.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Teach them better manners.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Old people cannot be taught much: they have not been taught in time. I hope we shall be able to make this a workable measure. It is demanded by country settlers, and I am not going to throw cold water on it. But speaking as I did before, when a motion was moved regarding bush fires, I say it is the Collie coal which is troubling us, and the scandalous way in which we have so far been treated by the Government of this country. I say our treatment has been scandalous and disgraceful; and it is a blot on any British Government. Those are the strongest words I can use. It is a scandal and a disgrace to any Government in the British dominions that we should have been treated as we have been for the last 18 months in regard to this Collie coal. I hope this Bill will do some good; and certainly some reform is badly wanted, in view of the trouble caused by the Railway Department setting alight our crops.

HON. W. MALEY: I move that the debate be adjourned for a week. I think some time should be allowed hon. members to digest this Bill.

Motion put and passed, and the debate adjourned accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the House, at its rising, adjourn till Tuesday next.

Put and passed.

The House accordingly adjourned at 29 minutes past 6 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 3rd September, 1901.

Papers presented—Question: Refrigerating Works, Cost, etc.—Police Uniforms, Coloured Labour—Question: Rabbits, Inspector, etc.—Question: Conservator of Forests, Appointment—Question: Northampton Mining, Particulars—Question: Zoological Gardens, Condition of Animals—Question: Drainage in South-West, Particulars—Criminal Code Bill, first reading—Return: Zoological Gardens, Cost and Mortality—Motion: Winery and Storage Cellars, State Aid (adjourned)—Assent to Loan Bill—Return: Gold Mining Leases, East Coolgardie, Particulars—Motion: Menzies-Leonora Railway, to Deviate Eastward (withdrawn)—Motion: Railway Workshops at Midland Junction, Inquiry as to Building and Equipment (Amendment passed)—Motion: Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply Scheme, to Complete Expeditiously—Municipal Institutions Act Amendment Bill, second reading—Trade Unions Bill, second reading—Workers' Compensation Bill, second reading (moved)—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL TREASURER: Financial Returns (on motion by Hon. F. H. Piesse).

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: Bunbury Harbour Works, Expenditure to 30th June, 1901 (on motion by Mr. T. Hayward).

Ordered to lie on the table.