

Motion put, and passed on the voices.

MR. THOMAS called for a division.

THE SPEAKER: There was not a quorum present, and therefore he would not be able to accept a division. If his attention was called to the fact that a quorum was not present within two minutes of a call for a division being made, he must adjourn the House.

MR. THOMAS withdrew his call for a division.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member could not now withdraw the call. We were in division, and the Speaker was bound to take notice of the fact that a quorum was not present.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member could withdraw his call for a division.

MR. MORAN: But the bells had been rung for a division.

THE SPEAKER: Yes; but we had been discussing the point of order as to a quorum not being present in a division, and that was why the bells had been ringing. No one had drawn his attention to the want of a quorum; but so soon as the division lists were handed to him he would be made acquainted with the fact that a quorum was not present, and he would then be compelled to take action.

Motion (adjournment) formally agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:59 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 9th October, 1902.

	PAGE
Papers ordered: Tick-infested Cattle	1491
Waterworks Inquiry, change of a member	1491
Bills: Justices, third reading	1491
Marine Stores, third reading	1491
Railways Acts Amendment, in Committee, progress	1491
Indecent Publications, second reading (adjourned)	1495
Public Works, in Committee, progress	1497

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, Return of the number of applicants for Pastoral Leases in the Kimberley District. 2, Department of Lands and Surveys—Regulations for the Guidance of Surveyors.

PAPERS—TICK-INFESTED CATTLE.

On motion by Hon. C. E. DEMPSTER (in the absence of Sir E. H. Wittenaar), ordered: That all papers in connection with the recent prosecution of W. D'Arcy Uhr, for illegally removing tick-infested cattle from quarantine contrary to the regulations dealing with transportation of Kimberley tick-infested cattle to the goldfields, *via* Fremantle, be laid on the table of the House.

WATERWORKS INQUIRY.

On motion by Hon. H. BRIGGS, the Hon. B. C. Wood was discharged from attending the select committee; and, after ballot, the Hon. J. A. Thomson was appointed in his stead.

JUSTICES BILL.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

MARINE STORES BILL.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

RAILWAYS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous day; the MINISTER FOR LANDS in charge.

Clause 13—Commissioner may requisition for rolling-stock, etc.:

HON. J. W. WRIGHT moved that the words "apply in writing to the Minister

for," after "may," in line 1, be struck out, and "purchase from revenue obtained" inserted in lieu. If the Commissioner wished to buy a few lengths of rail, or even to make a temporary crossing, he must apply in writing to the Minister; and in the Minister's absence, such permission could not be obtained even in emergencies.

HON. M. L. MOSS opposed the amendment. If Victoria had had a clause like this while Mr. Alison Smith had charge of the locomotive department, that colony would have saved millions of money. One of the greatest blots on the Victorian system had been the unlimited power to order goods. The clause provided that the Commissioner should not incur such liabilities without written application to the Minister, thus providing a complete record of materials asked for. To permit the Commissioner to make purchases at will out of a revenue of one and a-half millions per annum would open the door, if not to fraud, to lavish expenditure.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: As the Commissioner could fix the sites of stations, that surely gave him equal power to perpetrate frauds.

HON. M. L. MOSS: But under the preceding clause the Commissioner could not spend sixpence. He could merely decide on the position of a station and afterwards obtain Ministerial approval for the construction. The Commissioner would requisition for stores and suggest the construction of stations. In the past there had been trouble through the construction branch interfering with the management. The two must be kept distinct. The Commissioner was a manager purely.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: "Construction," in railway parlance, meant new works, not alterations.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Additions and improvements.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 14—Quarterly reports to Minister:

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Sub-clause (c), providing that the Commissioner must report to the Minister as to appointments and removal of employees, with the circumstances attending each, would involve unnecessary work and expense. It should be sufficient if he reported when directed by the Minister. He (Mr. Con-

nolly) moved that Sub-clause (c) be struck out.

Amendment passed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The quarterly reports were intended to give publicity to certain transactions; and if not made public before being submitted to Parliament, twelve months might sometimes elapse, and the matter would then be stale and the accumulated reports could not properly be discussed. The reports should, at the option of the Minister, be published at once. He moved that there be added to the clause: "but the Minister may, if he think fit, publish the said reports forthwith, on his receiving them."

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Deputations:

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: The clause did not go far enough. Members of Parliament should interview the Minister and not the Commissioner; but why allow any deputation to interview the Commissioner? Probably the clause was intended to prevent political pressure on the Commissioner; but this might proceed from any person. He moved that the words "in which a member of Parliament takes part or at which he is present," in lines 1 and 2, be struck out.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendment was objectionable. Business people might wish to see the working manager rather than the Minister. Two or three persons or even one would form a deputation, if representing the opinions of others.

HON. G. RANDELL: To prevent the exercise of undue influence on the Commissioner was desirable; but a deputation as to small details should see the Commissioner rather than the Minister, though the Minister would probably ask the Commissioner to be present if the question were one of detail and not of policy. No harm could arise from leaving the clause as it stood, and some difficulty might arise if we struck out the words the hon. member proposed to strike out.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Could a single member interview the Commissioner?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: A single member was not debarred by the clause from doing so.

HON. R. LAURIE: It would probably be better that a member of Parliament

should not be on a deputation to the Commissioner; but it would be wrong not to allow deputations to see the Commissioner, because in four or five minutes they might be able to impress him and cause an evil to be remedied.

HON. W. MALEY: According to the clause, a deputation which included a member of Parliament was not allowed to interview the Commissioner. He suggested that the wording should be altered so that a member should not "address" the Commissioner.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Matters would be facilitated by allowing the clause to remain as at present.

Amendment withdrawn, and the clause passed.

Clauses 17, 18—agreed to.

Clause 19—Government railways vested in Minister:

HON. J. W. WRIGHT moved that the word "Minister," in line 1, be struck out, and "Commissioner" inserted in lieu.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 20, 21—agreed to.

Clause 22—Penalty for permitting animals to trespass on railway:

HON. R. G. BURGESS moved that the clause be struck out. There were hundreds of miles of country not fenced, and a large number of fences throughout the State were only toy fences. The clause was absurd.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Unless the Government took some steps to prevent stock from going on the line, it would be most unfair for people to not only lose their animals but to pay a fine.

HON. E. McLARTY: The clause was most rigorous. He could safely say that £100 would not recompense him for the cattle he had lost in various places through their being killed. The clause asked people to do what was an impossibility. How was a man to prevent his cattle from straying on the railway when there were scores of miles of land unfenced? It was the duty of the Government when they took land to protect the railways by fencing. In many instances the gates of station-yards were left open, and the fences were of no use. The Government induced stock to come to the railway between here and Bunbury: holes were dug in the embankments,

and the first rainwater ran into them, that water was preserved, and cattle came long distances to get the water. Again, when summer set in, permanent-way men burned land on the side of the line, and young feed grew. He had seven head of cattle killed in a fortnight.

HON. B. C. WOOD supported the striking out of the clause, as it would mean another hardship upon the settlers. It would be very hard lines for them to be fined for cattle straying, when the Government took no trouble to keep cattle off the line.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: There were, he believed, by-laws now, and where was the necessity of making this provision in the Bill?

Amendment passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 23—agreed to.

Clause 2 (postponed)—Interpretation:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: On inquiry, he had found that the meaning of "clerical staff" was so clearly understood by the department that a definition was unnecessary and practically impossible, because the *personnel* of the staff varied from time to time. While this staff did clerical work, sometimes it overlapped the technical work; and it must occasionally be optional whether an officer was "clerical" or "professional."

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Then the schedule read last night by Mr. Moss did not apply.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The statement last night had been that certain persons scheduled in the Act of 1887 could be dismissed summarily, and therefore were not on the clerical staff.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Railway experts deemed it inadvisable and impossible to make a clear definition.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 (postponed)—Classification:

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE moved that the following be added to the clause: "Provided that the Commissioner shall have power to employ, fine, or dismiss any officer or employee." Apparently the power to dismiss was too indefinite. An engine-driver recently dismissed for drunkenness was appealing to the Arbitration Court for reinstatement. This would cost the country some £50.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Act of 1887 gave the Commissioner

power to fine or dismiss, summarily or otherwise, anyone included in the schedule. The amendment was therefore unnecessary. The main object of this Bill was to make it clear that the Commissioner should manage the railways, while the Minister for Works controlled construction. This measure did not interfere with the 10 or 12 existing Railways Acts, which the Government hoped next session to consolidate.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The amendment sought to empower the Commissioner to dismiss finally. At present, dismissals were subject to the approval of the Governor. Why should the State give a right of appeal not granted to private employees? The amendment would prevent political influence.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Did the mover wish to change the existing law?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Yes.

HON. E. McLARTY supported the amendment. The railways could not be properly managed unless the Commissioner had final power to dismiss unsuitable men. Why give a right of appeal?

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: An incapable man should be at once discharged and another substituted. Why appoint a manager without power to dismiss servants?

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Better withdraw the amendment, and on recomittal move to repeal Section 3 of the Act of 1887.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Agreed.

Amendment by leave withdrawn, and the clause passed.

New Clause—Commissioner may refuse to carry second-hand fruit cases unless disinfected:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill:—

The Commissioner may refuse to carry second-hand fruit cases, or cases or packages that may reasonably be supposed to have contained fruit, unless such cases are disinfected in accordance with the regulations of the Department of Agriculture in force for the time being.

Second-hand fruit cases frequently had fruit parasites and germs of disease; and this the department, as common carriers, had no power to prevent. Growers had suggested that this power be given the Commissioner; and it would

be easy to provide disinfecting apparatus at large centres like Perth and Kalgoorlie, whence such fruit cases came. Save by this means the difficulty could not be met.

HON. W. MALEY: If the amendment were passed and an orchardist forwarded his fruit in clean cases to Perth, the department could and probably would cause him great inconvenience by delaying their return at a critical moment when he required them to get to market perishable fruit such as peaches and apricots, and a delay of a few hours might be important.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The convenience of the agriculturists or horticulturists should not be considered against the graver and more important question of disease.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: All cases had to be inspected.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: They were inspected, but they passed out and we did not know what might happen to them afterwards. All that was asked was that there should be a certificate that the cases had been disinfected. There was a desire to protect our young orchards. This was simply one of those provisions to prevent the spread of disease in the orchards throughout the State, and it seemed to him to be very desirable.

HON. R. G. BURGESS said he would like to understand whether these cases were properly disinfected. It would be useless to pass this clause if the cases were not properly disinfected.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: They were; in Fremantle all cases that arrived were thoroughly disinfected.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: From what he had seen of the two places, fruit and cases were inspected in a very bad way. Only last week he saw fruit which was a disgrace to sell.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Where did it come from?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It was imported fruit. It was no use passing clauses unless the provisions were properly carried out. He had within the last 10 days seen imported fruit in cases which had never been inspected. He did not wish to put any obstacle in the way of stopping these diseases, but the whole thing rested in the ports. There had been a cry that two or three people

were making fortunes out of fruit growing, but if members went to them some of these fruitgrowers would tell them there was a great deal of work and very little profit.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was with regret he heard that fruit had been imported into the State in the condition in which Mr. Burges said it was. He could only say he had repeatedly observed the process of examination of the fruit at the port of Fremantle, and he had also observed it in many parts of Europe. He had never seen it more perfectly carried out than at Fremantle. All the visits he had made had been surprise visits. He would like Mr. Burges to accompany him to see what was done. So many members spoke of these things who knew absolutely nothing about them. Having taken all the trouble we had, we found with regret that it was not sufficient. We had pests in the State already, such as the fruit fly, which was becoming a very grave pest, and that was the one it was particularly wished to guard against by having all the cases disinfected. There were some portions of the State which the fruit fly had not yet reached. There were many other pests which he could mention. He thought he could mention quite half a dozen which would be prevented by what he suggested here.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Fruit had been let in which was a disgrace to the State. He did not want to object to the clause, but it would be of very little use if we had fruit brought in which was not properly inspected.

HON. E. McLARTY: The Minister was doing that which every conference he (Hon. E. McLarty) had attended for several years had been harping for, to have these fruit cases disinfected. The argument of Mr. Burges showed the necessity of this clause. It had been suggested that no second-hand cases should be used at all, but that would be a tremendous waste of timber and of money. What was wanted was to have the cases disinfected and returned.

HON. C. SOMMERS: This clause was badly needed, and if carried it would to a very great extent prevent the spread of disease. As to the inspection at ports, he had paid surprise visits, and he could congratulate the officer of that department on the way in which his duty was

carried out. To make orchardists use new cases would be a hardship.

On motion by **HON. F. T. O. BRIMAGE**, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

INDECENT PUBLICATIONS BILL.

SECOND READING (MOVED).

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to point out that last session a Criminal Code was enacted. Clause 204 of the code provides that "Any person who knowingly and without lawful justification or excuse publicly sells or exposes for sale any obscene book or other obscene printed or written matter, or any obscene picture, photograph," or "who exposes to view in any place to which the public are permitted to have access, whether on payment of a charge for admission or not, any obscene picture, photograph, drawing, or model, or any other object tending to corrupt morals, or publicly exhibits any indecent show or performance, whether on payment of a charge for admission to see the show or performance or not, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for two years." But it has been found that this provision in the code is not strong enough to grapple with the very serious difficulty which exists in this country and which has existed in other parts of Australia and in Great Britain, where the law is not adequate to the punishment of persons guilty of many of the acts this Bill aims at preventing. The Bill is largely based on an Act in force in New South Wales, and is in many respects similar to an Act of the Imperial Parliament. When the latter measure was before the House of Lords, it was referred to a select committee, and passed through Parliament with very little discussion. It might be in keeping with the measure now before us, were I permitted to read two short extracts giving opinions expressed in the Imperial Parliament as to the necessity for legislation of this kind in England. One speaker said:—

The result is that it is almost impossible to pass down certain streets of this large city without having thrust into one's hands indecent and filthy publications which ought not to come before the eyes of any decent man or woman. The cause of this is the present

impunity for disseminating such indecent literature, and I think your lordships will agree with me that it is very desirable that general powers should be given to the magisterial body for the purpose of putting in force the enactments and dealing with this evil.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking on the measure, expressed himself as follows:—

I am glad that this Bill has been introduced, and I thank the noble and learned lord for pointing to very necessary amendments. It is, of course, exceedingly important that in pressing forward measures of this kind no injustice should be perpetrated. At the same time, few people are aware of the underground prevalence of this evil, which may in large measure counteract the good done by education. The child leaving school is supplied with literature of this kind to an astonishing extent. Indecent papers, professing to be of a medical character, are scattered broadcast. Even the recreation grounds of the poor of London are defiled by literature of this character, and thus turned into a propaganda of evil. The country is strewn with these abominable papers. There is no religious society which operates, by the distribution of leaflets and pamphlets, with the vigour of those who circulate these publications.

These are strong remarks; and I think they apply with much force in this State.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: They do not. Tell us what the Imperial Act is.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I will give one illustration, of which I am fully cognisant, to prove that what I say is correct. Within the last three or four weeks my own child, a little fellow of four and a-half years of age, brought me two small pamphlets which, on questioning him, I found he had received from a man in my yard. The pamphlets were perfectly disgusting, such as those the publication of which is sought to be prevented by Clause 4 of the Bill. They were utterly unfit for any girl or any young man to read.

HON. W. T. LORON: Not fit to be read at all.

HON. M. L. MOSS: No; neither by a young man or a young woman. They had only one tendency—to lead to great immorality in the community. Moreover, it is disgraceful that certain books should be sold by many booksellers in this country; and equally disgraceful are certain advertisements which appear in some of our newspapers.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That does not touch the Imperial Act.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Whatever is in the Imperial Act, and what I have quoted from the Archbishop of Canterbury and another speaker, apply with great force to what is going on in this community. I do not think any legislation is too drastic to deal with these evils. In another place it was stated by the Premier that the president of the Pharmaceutical Society had approached him with regard to the literature of which I have just spoken. On this matter I do not think any of us require information; I think we are all well aware of what is going on, and how disgusting pamphlets are circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country with the idea of selling quack medicines. If Dr. Hackett be not aware of this, I can assure him such publications are circulated most industriously.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Imperial Act deals with that.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I believe this measure will be fraught with great good to the community; and, moreover, I think it protects newspapers in a way in which they hardly deserve to be protected.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Now you are going away from the Imperial Act.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I am dealing with the Bill before the House; and, so far as newspapers are concerned, I say it is, in many respects, too liberal. Conductors of newspapers are supposed to be intelligent; and they know that when a filthy advertisement is brought to them for publication it ought to be refused.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: But this legislation is nonsensical.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Under clause 6, newspapers are to get a warning, and are hedged around by the protection that before proceedings can be taken the written authority of the Commissioner of Police or the Attorney General must be obtained. I think both the men who sell indecent books and the newspaper conductors or proprietors who publish disgusting advertisements should be dealt with by a drastic law. Is it for the moral good of the community that such publications should be tolerated? In my opinion it is most detrimental to the morals of the community; to improve those morals is certainly one of the

duties of Parliament; and, if a disease exist, we should see whether it can be prevented. Personally I have no hesitation in saying that this is a measure of which I very cheerfully move the second reading, and one to which I hope the House will agree.

On motion by HON. J. W. HACKETT, debate adjourned.

PUBLIC WORKS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister) in charge.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

HON. G. RANDELL: As roads and streets were to vest in His Majesty, was it intended that the Director of Public Works should have power over them; and if so, to what extent? Would the streets of a town as well as country roads be included in the definition of "Crown lands"? Secondly, "public notice" was defined as a notice in the *Gazette* or by such additional means as the Minister might think fit. It was undesirable to limit notices to the *Gazette*. They should be published in local newspapers also.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The definition of "Crown lands" was for the purposes of this Bill simply; and unless there were in the Bill anything inconsistent with existing Acts, the Bill would not interfere with the rights of municipalities or of roads boards. Even now, however, such bodies did not own the fee simple, but were charged with care, control, and management only. This power they would retain unless some clause in the Bill empowered the Minister to control roads and streets. As to "public notice," the Minister would always advertise in the *Government Gazette*, and, when possible, locally. There might not be a local newspaper. These comprehensive words would enable the Minister to give the public notice by any means he saw fit.

HON. J. W. HACKETT called attention to the definition "Crown land," and said he approached this question with a certain amount of irritation. If there was anything the House had made plain, it was that we would not have the lands dedicated to public purposes interfered with by the Public Works Department. This was another attempt to evade the

principle of Class A reserves. The next time it happened, he would move for a select committee to find out whether the draftsman or the Government were responsible for this flouting of the opinion of the House. He moved that the paragraphs in the clause be put distributively.

Motion (Dr. Hackett's) agreed to.

Paragraph 1 put and passed.

Paragraph 2—"Crown lands":

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the words "or land reserved under the Permanent Reserves Act, 1899," be added.

HON. M. L. MOSS asked the Committee to agree to the postponement of this paragraph until the end.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Minister could have no objection to incorporate the substance of the amendment.

HON. M. L. MOSS: While not objecting, he wanted to consider it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Let the amendment be adopted. He would ask the Committee to once more declare their intention as to these public reserves, and put it in black and white. Then Mr. Moss might, if he pleased, alter it or introduce words to modify it.

HON. M. L. MOSS: There was no desire to oppose the insertion of the words. He regretted that Dr. Hackett had thought fit to deliver the speech he had, blaming the Government; for after all it was possible that a slip had occurred, and as far as he (the Minister) knew there was no idea on the part of the Government to include permanent reserves, particularly reserves in Class A. The paragraph had passed under the purview of the Attorney General, the Parliamentary Draftsman, and others.

Amendment passed, and the paragraph as amended agreed to.

Paragraphs 3, 4—agreed to.

Paragraph 5—"Local authority":

HON. J. W. WRIGHT moved that the words "or road board, and any persons or body, however designated," in lines 2 and 3, be struck out. Clause 10 gave these bodies power to take any land required for the purpose of such work. He thought that this was putting too much power in the hands of local boards.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The local authorities could not take land at all. A number

of formalities had to be gone through, and the Minister might exercise this power on behalf of the local authorities. Upon the publication in the *Government Gazette* of the proclamation of the Governor, the land vested in His Majesty or the local authorities, as the case might be, and the formalities described in the Act were brought into operation. The local authority could not themselves come in under this proclamation and take land, but if they desired to get it they had to apply to the Ministry of the day and obtain their authority.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Surely towns were represented by municipal councils, and districts by roads boards. The definition should stand.

Amendment negatived.

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the words "but shall not include any reserves except those gazetted under the Permanent Reserves Act, 1899," be added to the definition of "public reserve." Mr. Moss had somewhat indignantly resented the justifiable warmth he (Mr. Hackett) had displayed. It was not believed that there was any conspiracy, but a degree of negligence amounting to great culpability; and with that he charged the Minister. Doubtless there was no deliberate intent to take away the rights of the people to those reserves which on their behalf Parliament had made permanent, because Clause 12 exempted from certain purposes of the Bill land gazetted under the Act of 1899.

HON. M. L. MOSS: After reading Clause 12, the hon. member should withdraw his charge of culpability.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Not that of negligence.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Sub-clause 2 of Clause 12 sufficiently safeguarded permanent reserves, and the amendment would be redundant.

Amendment passed.

HON. D. CONNOLLY moved that progress be reported.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	6
Noes	10
				—
Majority against	4

AYES.
 Hon. J. W. Hackett
 Hon. A. G. Jenkins
 Hon. W. T. Loton
 Hon. E. McLarty
 Hon. G. Handell
 Hon. J. D. Connolly
 (Teller).

NOES.
 Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
 Hon. R. G. Burges
 Hon. C. E. Dempster
 Hon. S. J. Haynes
 Hon. A. Jameson
 Hon. R. Laurie
 Hon. M. L. Moss
 Hon. J. E. Richardson
 Hon. J. W. Wright
 Hon. C. Sommers
 (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

At 6-25, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
 At 7-30, Chair resumed.

On motion by HON. M. L. MOSS, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 7-33 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,
 Thursday, 9th October, 1902.

	Page
Food Duties, Personal Explanations	1498
Question: Rabbit Department, how managed	1499
Bills: Mines Development, Reinstatement after count-out; second reading (resumed)	1499
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, in Committee, progress	1500
Constitution Act Amendment (Redistribution of Representation), second reading moved	1508
Redistribution of Seats, second reading moved	1526

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

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Copy of Regulations for the guidance of Surveyors.
 Ordered: To lie on the table.

FOOD DUTIES—PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES (Claremont): I ask leave to make a personal explanation with regard to the division last evening