

member for East Perth to lay down what was right and what was wrong. The position which he (Mr. Moran) took up was that free, compulsory, and secular education should be granted to everyone who wanted it. He did not want the hon. member (Mr. James) to level charges at him (Mr. Moran) of stirring up religious strife, because they were not true: he had never said one disrespectful word against any religious denominations in Western Australia, and the hon. member (Mr. James) knew it.

New clauses (Mr. Vosper's), by leave, withdrawn.

Schedule and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House, at 10:50 p.m., adjourned until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 16th August, 1899.

Papers presented—Return ordered: Metropolitan Waterworks Board, Particulars—Motion: Rabbit Pest, Prevention—Dog Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Supreme Court Criminal Sittings Bill, third reading—Police Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Evidence Bill, in Committee, reported—Resolution: Women's Franchise, postponed—Weights and Measures Bill, second reading, in Committee, reported—Customs Consolidation Amendment Bill, first reading—Permanent Reserve Bill, first reading—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Report of Governors of High School, 1899; 2, By-laws, Cottesloe Roads Board; 3, Regulation 123a, under Goldfields Act.

Ordered to lie on the table.

RETURN—METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS BOARD, PARTICULARS.

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved:

That there be laid upon the table of the House a return, showing: 1, The names of persons employed on the Perth Waterworks Board at the date of appointment of the present board; 2, The names of persons appointed since that date, and the salary; 3, By whom appointments are made.

It was necessary that hon. members should know by whom the appointments were made. From what he had heard, there was great dissatisfaction as to the ramifications, the management, and the dealings of the board with the public; there was also friction between the old and the new employees. He was not speaking authoritatively, but was given to understand that this was the case. He wanted information, and, probably, he would base a motion upon it at some future date.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—RABBIT PEST, PREVENTION.

HON. C. A. PLESSE (South-East) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the near approach (to the more settled portion of the colony) of the dreaded rabbit pest necessitates the adoption of most stringent measures to prevent their further incursions.

This matter was brought up annually, and it was time that something definite and satisfactory were done in regard to the incursion of rabbits. The Government, he understood, had tried by various means to find out the number of rabbits there were in the country, and the extent of country covered by them; but so far as the information in regard to the number of rabbits in this country was concerned, it was very vague, and he found the greatest difficulty in obtaining any definite information on this matter, although he had been seeking for information on this point for the past six months. There had been the greatest difficulty in finding anyone who had seen rabbits at all. The only evidence of the existence of rabbits was the tracks and the droppings; but when we took into consideration that the tracks and droppings of several native animals of this country resembled the tracks and droppings of the rabbits, that evidence was not very definite. Possibly a lot more had been made of the incursion of rabbits than was really necessary.

No doubt there were rabbits in the country, but they were not at all numerous.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: What did the hon. member propose to do?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: In the past no suggestion had been brought forward for successfully coping with the rabbit question; no suggestion had been made to help the Government in this matter.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Government had sent some cats out.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: When one considered that New South Wales had offered £20,000 reward for a successful method of destroying rabbits—that reward was still available—and no one had been able to discover any successful means of getting rid of the pest, members could understand how difficult it was to suggest some reliable means of destroying rabbits. Attempts had been made to find means of destroying them, but these had not been successful. It had been proposed in the past that fences should be erected, and that was the popular idea to-day; but it had been proved that to erect fencing was almost waste of money, so far as the other colonies were concerned. In South Queensland, something like 11,000 miles of fencing had been erected, and it cost between £11,000 and £12,000 per annum to maintain the fencing in order. The difficulties there were something like those we had to cope with here. In the more densely settled districts, localities were grouped, and the settlers endeavoured to exterminate the rabbits. Poison had been brought into requisition, and microbes of chicken cholera had been successfully used, particularly in Queensland; but it was rather dangerous, he believed. Shooting and hunting had also been tried. It would be utter folly to erect fencing, and particularly in that part of the country referred to, where it would cost thousands of pounds more than in settled districts, and the upkeep would be enormous. To look after a fence running 20 miles inland would cost some thousands per annum.

A MEMBER: Did the hon. member propose that the money should be spent?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No; he proposed that the difficulty should be met in another manner, and that one of the first conditions of improvement mentioned in the Land Act should be the erection of rabbit-proof fencing. Let the induce-

ment be so good that it would be to the advantage of every man taking up land to erect a rabbit-proof fence. If something of that kind were done, no doubt we should be ready for this pest. If the pest was coming we should have the same trouble as had been experienced by the farmers in the other colonies. He would like the Colonial Secretary to inform the House as to the result of the efforts made in the past. He believed there was a lot in the system of sending out cats, at which some persons laughed. So far, the rabbits had been kept down purely by the jackal and other carnivorous animals. We were offering so much reward for the destruction of the dingo, which was an enemy of the rabbit, and were trying to exterminate dingoes as fast as we could; and now, so far as he knew, we only had the native cat besides. One did not want to introduce what would become a pest to the country, and the more closely we looked into the matter the more difficult it became. He saw no way out of the difficulty except doing what they had to do eventually in the other colonies, namely, have rabbit-proof fencing.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): Inasmuch as agricultural members of the House expressed an opinion on matters purely legal, he might be forgiven if he spoke on a subject which was agricultural or pastoral. He might offer a few observations that would assist the House in coming to a conclusion. It had been asserted that the Government had done nothing to cope with the rabbit pest. The member who had just spoken did not believe the prints seen were rabbit prints at all. That gentleman believed no person had seen rabbits, and that the Government ought to take greater steps, presumably so that rabbits might be seen.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: One rabbit was brought into Eucla.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: One was brought into Eucla, and we were to spend thousands of pounds! It was suggested we should ask every man who took up land in that district to fence it; but it would be absurd to make such a request.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The hon. member did not understand the question.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The question was understood by him as much as the hon. member understood questions of

law. The hon. member suggested that any person who took up land in the South-West District should erect a rabbit-proof fence. Let him make a commencement himself.

THE PRESIDENT : The time for bringing this forward would be when dealing with the Land Bill.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : What did the hon. member want the House to do? He talked of rabbits, kangaroos, and cats, but did not tell us what he wanted. He said that in Queensland they had chicken cholera. Did he suggest we should have it here? The people in the district the hon. member represented would be able to live there if they had rabbits, but at the present time rabbits had nothing to live upon. He (Mr. Haynes) would be opposed to urging the Government to do more than they were doing at present. Seeing that the Minister of Lands was quite alive to the importance of keeping the rabbits out of this country, and that he was well posted in all the information on the subject, the carrying of this motion would practically be charging the department and the whole of the Government with laxity, want of foresight, and dereliction of duty.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : Members had a right to bring these things forward.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : The passing of the motion would practically be a want of confidence in the Minister of Lands.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : Nonsense.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : It would be asking the Minister to take stringent steps, and yet hon. members did not know what steps had been taken by him.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : How was the hon. member aware they did not know?

HON. R. S. HAYNES : If they knew, why did they not state what had been done? There were no rabbits.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : Reports on the subject had been presented.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : The hon. member interrupting him thought it sufficient for the motion to be introduced without one word being said. He (Mr. Haynes) would like to be clear on the question whether there were any rabbits. Did he think there had not been enough money spent in the South-Western District?

HON. R. G. BURGESS : The land was in the Eastern District. It was not in the Eastern Province.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : In his opinion no one knew where it was.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : The hon. member did not know the country.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : No doubt he was accused of not knowing anything. He seldom accused other people of not knowing anything. Perhaps the hon. member had been to the place and knew all about it.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : Yes.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : Perhaps both hon. members had been there.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : Both had been there.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : They had been there all their lives, he should imagine, from the way in which they spoke to the motion. If they could give some reason why he should support the motion he would do so, but as a matter of fact the hon. member who introduced it said there were no rabbits.

HON. C. A. PIRSE : Nothing of the kind was said by him.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : The hon. member said none had been seen, and Mr. Burgess said one had been seen.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : What he said was that one had been killed.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : Why did not the mover of the motion put it into proper shape, and say the Government should do this, that, or the other? If the House passed a motion that the Government should adopt the most stringent measures without specifying any measures, members would be laughed at.

HON. C. A. PIRSE : The motion was passed last year and the year before.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : If so, it had no effect, and that was the strongest argument against its present introduction. If he were a Minister in charge of a department and the motion were put before him, he doubtless would say "The matter will be attended to in due course." That was the general official answer.

HON. F. T. CROWDER (South-East) : How the gentleman who had just resumed his seat could expect any reliance to be placed on his statements, when he asserted that the settlers in the Wagin District had no means of living, he did not know.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : That was not said by him. He thought the hon. member represented the South-Western District.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: One would have thought, after the remarks made and the whipping the hon. member got over the Goomalling statement, he would have been more careful before making assertions which had no facts in them.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Where were the rabbits?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The hon. member said the motion passed had no effect; but that was not correct. The Government had sent out inspectors, who had located the rabbits, and found that thousands were approaching the border. It was impossible for the member who moved the motion to lay down any hard-and-fast proposition as to how the Government should give effect to this proposal. Those who had taken any trouble to watch what the rabbits had done in the other colonies knew how very hard it was to exterminate the pest. With regard to South Australia, he could speak from experience as to the devastation there effected by rabbits. Rabbits had cost South Australia something like twenty million pounds. A vast number of sheep had been lost, and a great amount of damage done to the pastoral industry. The South Australian Government had spent a million and a half upon fencing. In some parts of the colony the South Australian Government had laid down poisoned wheat, and owing to the destruction of birds, the locusts came down in hundreds and committed destruction. It was very difficult indeed to know how to deal with the question. As to fencing, it had been proved a failure.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Against locusts?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Not against locusts. They tried cats in New South Wales, which, he believed, crossed with the rabbits, and instead of having a rabbit which could only eat the bark to a certain height they produced an animal that could climb to the top of the tree. Many experiments had been tried, but so far they had all failed to have the desired effect. If the motion were passed, the Government would watch the border of the colony as closely as they could, and if rabbits were coming in millions, as they had done in the other colonies, we must take the best steps known. But he did not think Western Australia a good land for rabbits, because most of the soil was

sandy, and when the rabbits burrowed, the sand would fall in upon them.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: What nonsense!

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Rabbits did not seem to thrive in this country, for where the rodents had been let loose they had died out. Rabbits were let loose on Carnac Island and at Rottneest, and to-day rabbits could not be found at these places, but the bones of them could be gathered up in large quantities. In the other colonies this pest had cost the Governments fully a quarter of million of money, therefore it was only right perhaps to do all that possibly could be done in endeavouring to try and check the spread of the pest in this country; for when rabbits got into Western Australia in large numbers, it would cost a large amount of money to get rid of them. The spending of a few thousand pounds in the initial stages might save the colony hundreds of thousands of pounds in the future.

HON. H. LUKIN (East): The Colonial Secretary told the House the other evening that the nearest point in the South-East where rabbits had been seen was at Mount Ragged, and the Chief Inspector of Stock had told him (Mr. Lukin) that rabbits were seen at Mount Ragged two years ago, but they had not been seen this side of that place. That was a pretty good proof that if the rabbits were encroaching, the encroachment was very slow. By a motion of this kind we might induce the Government to squander a lot of money in trying to stop the incursion of rabbits, when the rabbits might never get here. We knew that rabbits had been the cause of great loss in the other colonies, but there were circumstances in this colony which were unique. The country the rabbits would have to pass through, to get into the settled districts, was very sterile, there was very little water in that country, and there were belts of poison country to pass through which would act as a check to the progress of the rabbits in this direction. At this juncture it would be unwise on our part to induce the Government to squander any more money in trying to stop rabbits reaching the more settled districts, until we were pretty sure that the rabbits were travelling towards those districts.

Question put and passed.

DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

SUPREME COURT CRIMINAL SITTINGS BILL.

Read a third time and *passed*.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by HON. F. M. STONE, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

EVIDENCE BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration resumed from 9th August.

Clause 10—Certain signatures to be judicially noticed:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY asked Mr. R. S. Haynes to withdraw the amendment of which he had given notice. Communication had been entered into between the Governments of the different colonies, including New Zealand, as early as 1897, and in that year this Bill was transmitted to this colony, and its consideration requested. The Bill was returned, suggesting the insertion of the word "master" in one clause, as we had an officer of that title in this colony. That amendment was consented to, and when the Premiers met in conference in Melbourne, they agreed to the Bill, and it was decided that all the colonies should introduce this Bill, and pass it for the purpose of facilitating the proof of legal documents, very largely documents concerning the Legislature, Acts of Parliament, and so on. In consequence of this arrangement, amendments could not be made in this Bill, which, if passed, would bring all the colonies into line in regard to this legislation. Hon. members would see that it would be impossible to introduce any amendments when the Bill had already passed several of the other colonial Legislatures.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The amendment of which he had given notice did not affect the principle of the Bill at all.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This Bill was passed by the Parliament of Victoria on the 30th of September of last year. Seeing that it had been agreed that all the colonies should pass this Bill, he was unable to accept any amendment:

the Bill must pass in its present form. The measure was a good one, and had received the attention and consideration of the legal members of another place, as well as the Crown Law Officers, so that there was no danger in passing the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was no amendment before the Committee at present.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 14, inclusive—agreed to.

New Clause:

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central) moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained to the contrary, it shall not be lawful to give in evidence before any Court any of the documents or papers mentioned in Sections 7 and 8 unless and until the party intending to do so shall have, seven days at least before tendering the same in evidence,— (a.) Given to the opposite party or his solicitor notice of such intention. (b.) Appointed a place convenient to the Court where, at any reasonable time within two days after the giving of such notice, such documents or papers may be inspected or copied by the opposite party or his solicitor.

This would provide that if one party to a suit wished to put in certain documents, that party must give notice to the opposite side of the intention to do so. That was a principle which no one could object to, and he could assure the Colonial Secretary that the addition of the clause proposed would in no way invalidate the Bill or detract from its effect. The Bill said that certain documents should be evidence, and he (Mr. R. S. Haynes) wished to provide that before the documents were tendered in evidence, the opposite party should be informed that the documents were to be tendered against him. The Colonial Secretary had pointed out that as the various colonies had agreed to introduce this Bill, it was necessary and proper that the provisions of the Bill should be identical in all the colonies. This amendment did not interfere with the provisions of the Bill; therefore the same law would be in force throughout the colonies; but in this colony the Bill would provide that, before the documents were used, the opposing party should have an opportunity of finding out whether the copy of the document tendered against him was a true copy. He had known a case in a Court in this colony in which a certified copy of a telegram was produced; but when the

original telegram was looked at it was seen that the certified copy was no copy at all; for in the part which determined the whole thing, the document had not been correctly copied, there being a variation accidentally made by a clerk, which anyone might have made. He thought the date certified to, in that instance, was wrong. Under this Bill a document might be sent over, certified by the other side, and the date appearing on that document might be all important. A person might certify without noticing the date, which might be an error, and have been inserted purposely by the person producing the document. It was of no use to say that frauds had not been perpetrated, for they had.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Did this Bill apply to telegrams or any such documents?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Telegrams were only instanced by him. The law was that before one could use a copy of a telegram in evidence, notice had to be given to the other party of the intention to do so, and they were to be allowed to inspect the copy. Clause 7 said:

Every document which by any law now in force, or hereafter to be in force in any Australasian colony, is or shall be admissible in evidence of any particular in any Court of Justice in such colony without proof of the seal, or stamp, or signature authenticating the same, or of the judicial or official character of the person appearing to have signed the same, shall be admitted in evidence to the same extent and for the same purposes before all Courts and persons acting judicially within Western Australia, without proof of the seal, or stamp, or signature authenticating the same, or of the judicial or official character of the person appearing to have signed the same.

In this colony a telegram could be admitted, if indorsed with somebody's certificate as a true copy of the actual telegram sent, under certain circumstances. That message had to be repeated. He did not know what Telegraph Acts existed in all other colonies, but in some colonies there were Acts somewhat similar to that here; therefore a telegram would actually be admitted here if it would be admitted in the other colonies.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: After the message was repeated?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes; but a person would not be allowed the opportunity of comparing that copy with the original. If he received a certain number

of days' notice of the intention to use it, and a place were appointed where he could see it within two days and take a copy, he could get a copy and wire to his agent in whatever place, and say "See if it is correct." Perhaps there would be suitors in a case, and suddenly a document would be sprung upon a person in Court. It was only fair that, before a certified copy was received in evidence without any proof whatever as to its authenticity, or that it had ever been examined with the original, one should have an opportunity of comparing the copy with the original. That would in no way operate against the Bill. It was of no use for the hon. member to tell the House it would wreck the Bill, unless some reason were adduced for such assertion, and he challenged him to give any reason. The hon. gentleman said there was a desire to have all the Acts the same throughout the Australian colonies. The Acts relative to the admission of evidence ought to be identical, and he was not in any way detracting from that. The Bill would be identical, except that we in this colony said "We will admit these documents, but you must give notice to the other side before you use them." The hon. member said this had passed through the Parliaments of the other colonies. That might be so, but the other Houses of Parliament did what this House frequently did—disregard the opinion of its legal members. This House was very much the same as other Houses, where, if a member of the legal profession proposed anything, it was suggested he was doing so for his own purposes. He would not be bound to accept Acts of Parliament because they were passed in the other colonies.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This was mutual legislation.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Other legal members would, he hoped, address the House on the question. He repeated that if the introduction of this clause vitiated the Bill or its usefulness in any way, he would withdraw it; but it was not sufficient for him to be told by an hon. member that somebody in his office had stated the measure was necessary.

HON. F. M. STONE: There was no objection to the clause being added to the Bill, as far as he could see. It did not touch the principle of the Bill at all, but simply provided that when it was

intended to put certain documents in evidence, the other side should receive notice, and be afforded an opportunity of perusing them, to see if they agreed with the originals. The clause would work with advantage, and therefore he would support it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Being one of the legal members of the House he would hardly be doing right if he refrained from expressing his views in regard to the amendment. A great deal of credit was due to Mr. Haynes for having thought of this, because it was a matter that might very easily have escaped other hon. and learned members of the House. The amendment was a good one and should be passed, because the difficulties mentioned might very easily crop up in connection with certified copies of any document. He would like the hon. member to explain what was meant by the words "a place convenient to the Court."

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There might be Circuit Courts. Supposing a person in a Police Court office or Local Court at Roebourne were going to tender something in evidence, he would have to give notice to the opposite party, and he must appoint a place convenient to the Court. He might appoint a place in Perth as the place for the inspection of the papers.

HON. F. M. STONE: Would it not be better to appoint a place in the town where the case would be heard?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It was to be a place convenient to the Court.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: For what purpose?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: For inspection.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: That being clear, the clause with a very slight amendment should commend itself to the House. He hoped the leader of the House would see his way to accept the amendment, for there was really no possible objection to it, and it would be a safeguard to litigants.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was rather difficult for him to argue against the members of the legal profession upon this point, but he took it the clause entirely altered the Bill. The Bill provided that all documents received as evidence in the other colonies were to be received as evidence in this colony. As to the evil mentioned by Mr. Haynes

with reference to a telegram, he thought it very remote.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Not at all.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If a fraud were perpetrated—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: A mistake; no fraud.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That would be obviated by the fact that a telegram would, as stated by the hon. member, have to be repeated before it was accepted as evidence. He understood the hon. member to say that.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. gentleman misunderstood him.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What he understood the hon. member to say was that, before a telegram was received in evidence, it would have to be repeated so as to ascertain that it was strictly correct. He could not see that any difficulty would arise in that direction; and if we altered the Bill, we should no longer be in line with the other colonies. Of course the House might do as they liked in the matter, but he did not propose to withdraw the Bill. If the House added the amendment, it would go to the Legislative Assembly and be there dealt with; but he really believed that it would not pass. He could not see that it would improve the Bill one iota. He believed every precaution had been taken here, and there was good ground for saying so, when we remembered that the Legislatures of the other colonies had passed the Bill as it stood. The Bill had been copied word for word throughout, in accordance with the request made.

HON. F. M. STONE moved that in paragraph *b*, line one, the words "convenient to the Court" be struck out, and there be inserted in lieu thereof "in the town where the Court, before which the evidence is to be tendered, is held."

Amendment put and passed.

New clause, as amended, put and passed.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment, and report adopted.

RESOLUTION—WOMEN'S FRANCHISE.

IN COMMITTEE—POSTPONEMENT.

Consideration of Legislative Assembly's Message, requesting concurrence in resolution, resumed from 8th August.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): In consequence of an understanding that this question was to be taken to-morrow, members were not prepared to go on with the debate. He moved that progress be reported.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was no progress to report. It would have been better if the hon. member had moved the postponement of the Order of the Day.

HON. J. W. HACKETT said he understood the Colonial Secretary was going to do so. That was the understanding which had been arrived at.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: We could go on with the debate, and then further adjourn it.

Motion—that progress be reported—put and passed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I think I need not detain the House more than a few minutes. The Bill can be dealt with better in Committee than on the second reading debate. I looked through the Bill in its original state carefully, I have also looked through the Bill in the condition in which it has reached this House from the Legislative Assembly, and I think with the amendments made in the Assembly, the Bill meets all the circumstances of the case. There are repeals of nearly the whole of two Acts of Parliament, and the measure is really a consolidating as well as an amending Bill dealing with the regulation of weights and measures. It is highly necessary we should have legislation on this matter in the terms of the Bill, so that they can be easily understood by all concerned. The Bill provides for standard weights and measures, and for measures of length being kept by the Municipal Council of Perth, called in the Bill, the Metropolitan Corporation. I am not quite sure whether it is intended that the measures of length, excepting the yard measure, shall be kept by the Metropolitan Corporation. I think these measures are still to remain with the Crown Lands Department. That matter was added during the passage of the Bill through the Legislative Assembly, and I think it is an improvement, because the Titles Office will only recognise the chain

measurement. There is a clause in the Bill referring to the different weights, providing that they shall not be of soft metal; if they are made of lead or other soft metal, they are to be encased in brass or copper. The weights have to be stamped so as to ensure correctness; and the Bill provides that these weights are to be adjusted every five years, but the Governor may at any time order copies of the standard weights and measures to be compared with the standards, and adjusted, if they require adjustment. This duty will have to be performed by the Metropolitan Corporation, and fees will be charged for the work done. Provision is made in the measure by which the inspectors who will be appointed under the Bill are strictly guarded, so as to prevent fraud or the sale of unauthorised weights. The penalties are pretty heavy, as they ought to be, on an officer who is entrusted with such a serious matter as this, to prevent him indulging in any speculation. The Bill provides that wheat and other cereals shall be sold by weight instead of by measure, and the schedule gives the weight for the different kinds of grain. The measure also provides that flour and the other mill products of grain shall be sold at 2,000lbs. to the ton; but in all other cases a ton shall be 2,240lbs. As far as I can gather from reading the Bill through, every interest has been provided for. Small quantities can be sold indifferently according to agreement between the purchaser and the seller. A livery-stable keeper may supply small quantities of fodder, and he has more liberty of action according to the Bill. Provision is also made that no action shall be brought against any person for anything done in pursuance of this Act, unless the information be laid within three months of the cause of action arising; but no plaintiff shall recover in any action for any irregularity or other proceeding if a tender of sufficient amends has been made before the action is brought. There is a provision for the sale of precious metals and diamonds by troy weight; and coal, coke, slack, culm and cannel of every description shall be sold by weight, and not measure. Cannel coal, I may observe, but probably hon. members are aware, has a large quantity of gas in it, and it

lights easily, almost like a candle. It is used for making gas, and I believe the etymology of the word "cannel" is from candle. Perhaps one of the important provisions of the Bill is contained in Clause 25, which states:

All persons who are desirous of adjusting any weights, measures, scales, balances, steel-yards, beams, or other weighing machines shall have access to the authorised copies deposited as aforesaid for the place within which the same are kept or used, at such times and upon payment of such fees as may be fixed by any by-law to be made in that behalf by the council of the municipality to which such authorised copies belong.

The inspector must compare the weights which are brought to him with the standard weights. The strongest regulations are embodied in the Bill in regard to the actions of the inspector, and as far as I can judge, every interest is protected by the measure. It is highly desirable that we should have an Act of this kind for the purpose of establishing the methods of our dealings with regard to weights and measures. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 34, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 35—Weights and measures to have contents marked:

HON. H. LUKIN: Would this clause apply to tare marked on railway trucks? All country people had lost considerably through the tare on our railway trucks being incorrect. He lost pounds and pounds by that means before he found out the defect, and he knew that others had also lost considerably. The matter ought to be set right by this Bill. It took him some time to discover where the loss was, and he was involved in a lot of very ugly correspondence, and nearly in a law suit. When he had discovered where the error lay he could obtain no redress. The year before last he lost over 20 tons of chaff, and having tested the matter he found the tare on some of our railway trucks was wrong to the extent of between three and four hundredweight. He thought this clause the best on which to raise the question.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause did not apply to the question, in his opinion, for nothing was said in it about the tare. There were certain ex-

ceptions in the measure, but he could see no clause making the trucks on the railway come under the Bill so far as tare was concerned. Clause 25 said, "all persons who are desirous of adjusting any weights, measures, scales, balances, steel-yards, beams, or other weighing machines, shall have access to the authorised copies." It was impossible to keep a copy of a railway carriage.

HON. H. LUKIN: The Bill ought to touch the matter referred to.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 36 to 47, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 48—Penalty for false weights, etc.:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The manner in which railway trucks were weighed would come under the operation of the Bill.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The Government had not the means in the country to weigh a bogie truck.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 49 to 55, inclusive—agreed to.

HON. H. LUKIN moved, without notice, that a new clause be added:

All railway trucks shall have their correct weight distinctly marked upon them.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was foreign to the Bill.

Schedules (7)—agreed to.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and report adopted.

CUSTOMS CONSOLIDATION AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

PERMANENT RESERVES BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5-55 until the next day.