

NOES.

Abigail, F.	Lee, C. A.
Ball, E. J.	Matheson, G. McL.
Black, R. J.	McCourt, W.
Bowman, A.	O'Connor, D.
Burdekin, S.	Parkes, Sir Henry
Burns, J. F.	Parkes, V.
Carruthers, J. H.	Roberts, C. J.
Clarke, W.	Ross, Dr. A.
Cooke, H. H.	Schey, W. F.
Davis, W. L.	Seaver, J. C. B. P.
Farnell, Frank	Smith, Frank J.
Foster, W. J.	Stephen, W.
Garrett, T.	Stevenson, R.
Hawken, N.	Street, J. R.
Hawthorne, J. S.	Thompson, R. W.
Haynes, J.	Wilkinson, Dr. W. C.
Henson, W.	
Inglis, J.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Ives, I. E.	McMillan, W.
Kethel, A.	Teece, W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Schedule agreed to.

New clause 6 (proposed by Mr. Burns) agreed to :

All contracts made on or before the thirtieth day of March one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven for the sale or delivery of any goods otherwise than in bond the duty on which is increased or decreased by this act shall be subject to an increase or decrease in the contract price of such goods corresponding in rate and amount with the amount of such increase or decrease of duty as aforesaid. Provided that it shall be at the option of either of the parties to any such contract by notice in writing under his hand to be served on the other contracting party or his agent being a party to such contract or agreement within fourteen days after the passing of this act to declare such contract or agreement null and void and the same shall thereupon be null and void accordingly.

Mr. BURNS: I promised hon. members that I would introduce a new clause to make it clear that persons who paid duties in excess of the old duties should be entitled to refund. There are about six articles, the duties collected upon which, at the present time, are in excess of the duties in this schedule. To meet these cases, I beg to propose the following new clause, to stand clause 7 of the bill:—

If any person shall have been required on or after the thirtieth day of March one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven to pay import duties upon any goods mentioned in schedule A of this act according to the rate prescribed by schedule A of the Customs Duties Act of 1886 he shall be entitled to a refund of the difference between the sum chargeable under the first and that chargeable under the second of the said schedules.

Clause agreed to.

Mr. DIBBS pointed out to the Treasurer that it was advisable to make some

arrangement for allowing refund to brewers who had large stocks of malt and hops on hand. Inasmuch as an excise duty was to be levied on beer, it would be unfair not to refund the brewers the duties which they paid on the malt and hops.

Mr. BURNS: I do not think that the stocks of malt and hops could have been very large, because the brewers had reasonable intimation of the intention of the Government to repeal the duties. I will take counsel on the matter, and see if anything can be done to meet the case.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 7:46 a.m. (Wednesday).

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 15 June, 1887.

Secret Bills of Sale Bill—St. James' Parsonage Land Leasing Bill—Pastures and Stock Protection Acts—City of Goulburn Gas and Coke Company's Act Amendment Bill (second reading)—First Readings.—Crookwell Roman Catholic Church Land Sale Bill (second reading).

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

SECRET BILLS OF SALE BILL.

Resolved (on motion by Mr. SALOMONS):

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the law for preventing frauds upon creditors by secret bills of sale of personal chattels.

ST. JAMES' PARSONAGE LAND LEASING BILL.

Bill read the third time.

PASTURES AND STOCK PROTECTION ACTS.

Mr. STEWART rose to move :

(1.) That this House disapproves of the new regulation, No. 40, of the Pastures and Stock Protection Acts, because, in the opinion of this House, it imposes obligations and penalties upon all owners of horses, cattle, and sheep throughout the colony not authorised by any law now in force.

(2.) That the foregoing resolution be communicated by address to his Excellency the Governor.

He said: This regulation was laid on the table of this House some time ago, and my attention was not called to it until some time afterwards. I have been repeatedly asked to explain whether it applied to the owners of horses, cattle, and

sheep all over the colony, and particularly I have been spoken to on the subject by residents of Sydney, who had been called upon, in some cases once, and in others twice, to fill up certain forms. I thought that the department had made some mistake. I think that it might as reasonably demand a return of the number of sovereigns and half-sovereigns, of hens and cocks, or of cats and dogs, which every person had on a certain day in the year. It may be that hon. members have not examined this regulation. The regulation which it supersedes applied to the owners of stock in a district liable to taxation for the destruction of noxious animals; but it is applied, without authority, to the whole colony. On the 27th April I asked the Representative of the Government:

By what law, or section of a law, is the Governor authorised to extend any of the provisions of the Pastures and Stock Protection Acts to all owners of horses, cattle, and sheep throughout the colony?

And the answer was:

Under sections 27 and 30 of the Pastures and Stock Protection Act.

Previously I had inquired:

1. Is it true that residents in Sydney are required to make a yearly return of the number of horses, cattle, sheep, and pigs owned or kept by them, under a penalty of £20; if so, upon what authority?

2. If not so, to whom does the new regulation, No. 40, under the Pastures and Stock Protection Acts, refer?

The hon. and learned member replied as follows:—

1. No; but under the regulation of 2nd November, 1886, issued under the Pastures and Stock Protection Acts, they are required to make returns of horses, cattle, and sheep.

2. It refers to all owners of horses, cattle, and sheep throughout the colony.

The new regulation reads as follows:—

Every owner of horses, cattle, or sheep, whatever the number may be, shall, between the 1st and 31st days of December in each year, make and deliver personally, or transmit by registered letter through the post to the inspector of stock for the district, a return in the form of schedule 12 hereto of the horses, cattle, or sheep owned or kept by him at the date of making such return.

In this return there has to be given the following information:—Name of run; name and address of owner, and of superintendent or person in charge; description of stock, whether horses, cattle, sheep, or pigs; number of each description;

[Mr. Stewart.

brands or marks; and the acreage of the entire holding, including freehold, leasehold, and Crown lands. It is requested that the correct address (including post town) of the person making a return shall be given. Every owner or superintendent has to make a declaration as to the correctness of his return, and the following note is given at the end of the document:—

All owners are cautioned that they will render themselves liable to a penalty of £20 if they do not make their returns between the 1st and 31st days of December in each year, and that the inspectors have been instructed to recover this penalty in every case in which it is incurred.

This illegal regulation requires the serious attention of the House. It is one thing to impose an obligation without legal authority; but it is another thing to enforce a penalty of £20 for a breach of that obligation. It may be that the magistrates in the country, thinking that the regulation cannot be wrong after passing both houses of Parliament, will inflict this penalty. I think that a brief reference to the law will show whether or not it is a lawful imposition. Section 27 of the Pastures and Stock Protection Act of 1880 provides:

If any person neglect or delay to make any return or to give any information with respect to any large stock or sheep required for the purposes of this act or shall give any incorrect or misleading information with respect thereto he shall on conviction for every such offence be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds.

What are the purposes of this act? The title of it is:

An act to protect the pastures and live stock of the colony from the depredation of certain noxious animals.

And in the preamble are these words:

Whereas the depredations of rabbits native dogs and marsupials in many districts of this colony have inflicted serious damage and loss on stockowners and it is necessary as well in the interest of owners and lessees of land as in that of the Crown to encourage the destruction of such animals and of such others as may be found detrimental to live stock pastures or crops.

It is hardly possible, I should think, in face of its preamble and title, to contend that the act was intended to apply to the whole colony. Section 2 of this act says:

The several sheep districts as defined and proclaimed under the Diseases in Sheep Acts in force for the time being shall be districts for the purposes of this act.

Section 3 of the Diseases in Sheep Act provides that

The colony shall be divided into conveniently sized sheep districts to be defined by proclamation by the Governor from time to time.

Showing very clearly that the operation of the act is confined solely to sheep districts which have been sanctioned and proclaimed by the Governor. The question of the Governor's power to make this regulation is involved in my resolution. Section 30 of 44 Victoria, No. 11, provides :

Upon receipt of a petition in that behalf from the board of any district it shall be lawful for the Governor by proclamation to be published in the *Gazette* to declare that this act shall be applied in any district to the destruction of any wild animals found to be detrimental to the stock or pasture of the colony for any period to be named in such proclamation and thereupon the provisions of this act shall be applicable to such animals and within such district as fully and to the same effect as if the animals named in such proclamation had been mentioned in the interpretation clause to this act. The Governor may also from time to time make such regulations as may be deemed advisable for the purpose of carrying out elections of directors for fixing the scale of payments for the destruction of any noxious animals for carrying out assessments and generally for accomplishing the purpose of this act and such regulations shall have the force of law when published in the *Gazette* and shall be laid before Parliament within fourteen days after the making thereof if Parliament be then in session and if not then within fourteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session.

It is quite clear that the power of the Governor is extremely limited, and that he has no right to impose a penalty for any disregard of this regulation. What assistance is it to the destroyers of noxious animals to have a list of the horses, sheep, and cattle in the colony? None whatever, I should think. The regulation, if it is a lawful one, ought to be enforced. These returns ought to have been sent in to the department during last December, but I have not heard of any prosecution for a non-compliance with the law. Why should the Government make the law ridiculous and contemptible in the eyes of the people? There is another reason why I should call attention to this matter. I believe that a large number of regulations are passed by the House without notice. I think that they should be either adopted on a specific motion or that some competent person should be charged with the examination of them. For fifteen years I had a great deal to do with municipal institutions on the coast. I was mayor for many years, and had a good deal to do with the con-

struction of by-laws and the administration of municipal affairs, and I found that the aldermen were strongly disposed at all times to extend the scope of the law by means of by-laws. At that time—about 1858—the Attorney-General or some other person used to take considerable interest in the enactment of by-laws, but I am afraid that of late years many of them have been passed without examination. It is the custom of municipal councils and boards of trust to pass improper by-laws without any check whatever. It was only the other day that the City of Sydney Improvement Board demanded a sum of £15 15s. from a citizen for fees. This gentleman happened to consult a lawyer, and he learned that they ought to have charged him only £8 8s. The board tried to bully the tenant into paying the £15 15s.; they threatened to sue the owner if he did not pay it; he told them to sue away, and, after some further bounce, they accepted £8 8s. I have not heard whether the board has refunded any of the unjust charges which it has collected hitherto. Had the by-law under which they acted been properly submitted to Parliament, probably this gentleman would not have been put to all this trouble. Another case of this kind occurred very recently. The last Parliament passed an act for the destruction of diseases in vines, with power to make regulations thereunder. Somebody interviewed the Minister the other day with respect to the operation of the measure, and he learned that it was not in force at all. Soon after the date on which it ought to have been enforced, a code of regulations was submitted to the Attorney-General, Mr. Foster, who, strange to say, looked into the matter and refused to sanction them, because they went altogether beyond the scope of the law. It used to be the rule, when municipal councils were first instituted, to examine all their by-laws. I should like to know, if it is held that this regulation is a lawful one, why persons have not been prosecuted for disregarding it? I am told that several persons have absolutely refused to make the return; one person went so far as to put two sets of blank forms in the fire; but had it been done by a poor cabman, or a widow with a cow or a sheep, probably the offender would have been threatened with a fine of £20. The regulation should

be altered in accordance with the law. It is a matter which should not be lightly passed over. I think that I have done my duty in calling attention to it.

Question proposed.

Mr. SALOMONS: I do not intend to say anything about what the hon. gentleman has said as to the City of Sydney Improvement Board, or the other matters of which he has heard. I can point out in a few words, I think, that there is scarcely one word in the motion which is accurate. It commences with these words:

That this House disapproves of the new regulation No. 40.

But I will point out in a moment that, with the exception of the word "sheep," it is exactly similar to the regulation which was made in January, 1882. The hon. member ought to have looked into the matter before he put this motion on the paper. It was noticed after the old regulation was passed that the expression "large stock" is interpreted by the act to include bulls, cows, and so on, but not sheep. It is as follows:—

Every owner of large stock, whatever the number may be, shall, between the 1st and 31st days of December in each year, make and deliver personally, or transmit by registered letter through the post, to the Inspector of Stock for the district, a return in the form of schedule 12 hereto of the large stock owned by him at the date of making such return.

There is not a word in that regulation about a "district." The new regulation begins not with the words "every owner of large stock," but with the words "every owner of horses, cattle, or sheep," and it has to be read with the schedule of the Pastures and Stock Protection Act, which begins with these words:

Return of all large stock (horses and cattle) now kept and depastured by ——— in the district of ———.

So that unless it is in a sheep district it does not apply; but in the Pastures and Stock Protection Act of 1881 there is this section:

For the purpose of raising a fund within each district for carrying into effect the provisions of this act * * * the board shall * * * make assessments on stock not exceeding in the annual aggregate threepence per head of large stock and one half-penny per sheep on sheep but no rate shall be levied upon any owner of less than one hundred sheep or ten head of large stock.

[Mr. Stewart.

Of course the board does not want to assess persons who have not got those numbers. The old and the new regulations are substantially the same, except with regard to the word "sheep." At the time the former was passed, the return of sheep was made under another act, and it was thought advisable, for the sake of economy and administration, to get all the information in one return. There is a section in the act of 1880 under which the Governor is authorised to make regulations. Section 30 reads:

The Governor may also from time to time make such regulations as may be deemed advisable for the purpose of carrying out elections of directors for fixing the scale of payments for the destruction of any noxious animals for carrying out assessments and generally for accomplishing the purposes of this act.

It must be seen that it would be quite impossible to make an assessment unless the persons in a sheep district were called upon to make a return. The law only requires a person to send a letter to the department, and if he has not 100 head in the one case or ten head in the other, nothing more is said about the matter, for he is not liable to any assessment. The colony is divided into sheep districts.

Mr. S. A. STEPHEN: Is Sydney a sheep district?

Mr. SALOMONS: Yes. The motion reads:

That this House disapproves of the new regulation, No. 40, of the Pastures and Stock Protection Acts, because in the opinion of this House, it imposes obligations and penalties —

It imposes no penalty of any kind; it draws attention to a section of the act under which a person may be fined 1d. or a sum not exceeding £20. Nor does it impose any obligations.

Mr. CREED: There is at the bottom of the schedule a note which says that owners will render themselves liable to a penalty of £20 if they do not make their returns.

Mr. SALOMONS: Under this regulation, I repeat, no penalty of any kind is imposed. The note is in these words:

All owners are cautioned that they will render themselves liable to a penalty of £20 if they do not make their returns between the 1st and 31st days of December in each year, and that the inspectors have been instructed to recover this penalty in every case in which it is incurred.

Mr. CREED: Upon what authority is the caution given?

Mr. SALOMONS: Under section 27 of the act of 1880; if it were done without legal authority of course it would be grossly wrong. What is wanted is to ascertain the number of stock in the colony, not only for the purpose of the act, but for statistical purposes. By section 27 of the act 44 Victoria, No. 11, it is provided that

if any person neglect or delay to make any return or to give any information with respect to any large stock or sheep required for the purposes of this act or shall give any incorrect or misleading information with respect thereto he shall on conviction for every such offence be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds.

That is, supposing that a person with 20,000 or 30,000 sheep returns only 10,000, he may be fined a sum from 1s. up to £20; but the regulation itself imposes no penalty, and therefore the motion in saying that it does is incorrect. It was thought that, instead of requiring two returns to be furnished, one for large stock, and another for sheep, it would be more considerate to owners of stock to allow them to send in one return, and therefore the term "large stock" has been extended so as to include sheep. The hon. member, Mr. Stewart, complains because the Government have not prosecuted persons who have failed to send in a return. Why should the Government prosecute them? The object of the regulation is simply to ascertain the number of stock in the colony, and if a person does not possess the number of stock required to make him liable to assessment, there is no necessity to prosecute him. How would it be possible to carry out the provisions of the act, or to make any assessment, unless the board had a return of the number of sheep and cattle? If they find out that people have not the number liable to assessment they do nothing whatever with regard to them. I am sorry that I have taken up so much of the time of the House; but out of respect for the hon. member, Mr. Stewart, who, I have no doubt, moved in the matter with the view of benefiting the public, I wished to show him that he was in error, and that the regulation is perfectly valid, and does not go one whit beyond what the act authorises.

Mr. DE SALIS: I think the Vice-President of the Executive Council is under a misapprehension. What the hon. member, Mr. Stewart, complained of was,

that the regulation goes too far. What is the use of telling us that it is not a new regulation, because it only differs in one word from the old regulations? If I understand the objection of my hon. friend, Mr. Stewart, aright, it is that the regulation is made to apply in cases where it was never intended it should apply. It was only intended to apply to persons who were in possession of (say) 500 head of sheep, or 100 head of cattle—that is to say, only to persons liable to be assessed under the Pastures and Stock Protection Act. But to my knowledge people who have only one horse or cow have been prosecuted and compelled to go a distance of 25 miles to court. I believe there are something like 100 persons in the district of Queanbeyan who have been so treated, and who are not liable to pay the assessment, yet they had to go and defend themselves, and they were let off, it was supposed very lightly, with a fine of 1s., and 10s. costs, for not doing what the law never intended that they should do. With regard to regulations generally, I have again and again contended in this House that no regulation ought to take effect until it has been approved of by both houses of Parliament. A regulation ought not to be more easily made than an act of Parliament. That used to be the case formerly; but little by little the practice was discontinued. There are boards which have the power to make what are practically acts of Parliament, and actually impose penalties and taxes which the law never sanctioned. The sooner such a state of things is done away with the better.

Mr. J. SMITH: I think the hon. and learned Vice-President of the Executive Council was not quite correct in stating that the object of the regulation was the production of one return instead of two. The owners of stock have three returns to make, and three classes of assessments to pay; one is under the Diseases in Sheep Act, another under the Pastures and Stock Protection Act, and the third under the Rabbit Nuisance Act. Now that the subject has been brought under the hon. and learned gentleman's notice, I hope that next session a general bill will be brought in, providing for only one return and one assessment. That will enable the Government to get rid of some of the inspectors.

Mr. SALOMONS : I wish to explain that I never said that the object of the regulation was to include all the returns in one.

Mr. JACOB : After what the Vice-President of the Executive Council has said it would seem almost superfluous to speak to the motion before the House were it not that there is a great principle involved in the question raised by some remarks of hon. members, more especially by the hon. member, Mr. De Salis. Before the Vice-President of the Executive Council showed that the regulation which the hon. member, Mr. Stewart, called a new regulation, is really an old one, with a slight modification, I should have been prepared to vote against the motion for the simple reason that unfortunately it is contrary to the letter of the law, although I believe it is according to the spirit of the law. Although the act gives power to frame regulations to carry out the law I do not think that the spirit of the law is to give power to make regulations in the direction in which this regulation runs; but as the act gives power to make regulations, and this regulation, being made under the act, it is not *ultra vires*, and, therefore, it would be absurd to pass the motion. The regulation should have been to the effect that any person possessing 100 head of sheep or ten head of large stock should make the return, because they are the only persons liable to assessment for the purposes of the act; but the regulation compels every person in a sheep district—and we are told that Sydney is a sheep district—who owns a horse or a cow or a sheep to make a solemn declaration before a magistrate, and either personally deliver it or forward it in a registered letter. A foreigner came to me, as a magistrate, and told me that because he owned a horse he was informed that he must make a declaration, or otherwise be liable to a penalty, and every cabman in Sydney is liable to a penalty if he neglects to make a declaration. It is all very well to say that a person may be fined 1s.; but he may be fined £20, and every one keeping a milch cow or a carriage-horse or a pet sheep has to make a declaration, under a penalty of £20. As to regulations generally, although I might not be prepared to go so far as to say that no regulation should have the force of law until

approved of by both houses of Parliament, still something of the kind should be done. When I was a member of the other branch of the legislature I and other members used to set ourselves against any clause in a bill giving power to frame regulations, the bill itself being often a mere skeleton. Regulations are often framed by some subordinate in a department, who has his peculiar crotchets, and consequently frames most absurd regulations. Under the Pastures and Stock Protection Act and the Pastures and Stock Protection Amendment Act a regulation was framed and solemnly promulgated in the *Gazette*, and laid before both houses of Parliament; but what is the meaning of it I cannot conceive, although persons are made liable to a penalty if they infringe it. It is as follows:—

Any person sending a hare out of the district in which it has been killed, shall split the near ear thereof, from the root to the tip, under a penalty not exceeding £10.

I had a hare sent to me some time ago, but the ear was not split in the manner there described, consequently the person sending it to me rendered himself liable to a penalty of £10. Under the Fisheries Act power is given to frame regulations, and, as I predicted when the measure was before Parliament, some absurd regulations have been promulgated under it. One is to the effect that if a bushel of prawns caught and sold contains a certain number of prawns under a certain size—that is, less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches from the tip end of the tail to a point between the two eyes—the person selling them shall be liable to a certain penalty. Fancy a regulation of that sort being solemnly promulgated. In nearly every act power is given to make regulations, but I contend that the power ought in every case to be such as is given in the Public Instruction Act. That act contains the following provision:—

It shall be lawful for the Governor to make regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act and copies of all such regulations shall be laid before both houses of Parliament within one month if Parliament be then sitting and if Parliament be not then sitting then within one month after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof and if not disallowed by resolution of both houses within one month of their being so laid before Parliament such regulations shall have the force of law and shall thereupon be published in the *Gazette* for general information.

The other day we had before us a bill imposing an excise duty on beer. That bill contained a clause which I should have strongly opposed, only that I knew that any amendment in such a bill introduced in this Chamber would not be taken notice of, otherwise I should have proposed to deal with it in the same way as the present Chief Justice proposed to deal with a similar provision in another measure, that is, that the regulations should not come into operation until they had received the assent of both houses of Parliament. That is the proper course to take; but, unfortunately, we pass measures giving power to almost anybody to make regulations, and consequently we have regulations of the character of those to which I have alluded. It is because I believe that the regulation referred to in the motion is within the letter of the law, although opposed to its spirit, that I cannot vote for the motion as submitted by the hon. member, Mr. Stewart, but the hon. member has my entire sympathy, as have the public, who are put to unnecessary inconvenience in having to make the declaration.

Mr. STEWART, in reply: If the Vice-President of the Executive Council had simply pointed out the law which makes Sydney a sheep district, he would have settled the whole matter, and there would have been no necessity for discussing the subject further. My opinion is that there are other motives than those mentioned by the hon. and learned member for requiring the returns. I find that on looking at the stock report for last year—a volume containing 500 pages—that the report of the Stock Branch does not occupy more than fifteen or twenty pages, and the rest of the volume is taken up by the names and particulars respecting owners of stock, the number of stock returned in a large number of cases being not more than three or four. What will be the size of the volume when it takes all the owners of horses and cattle within the metropolitan district? It will then be three times its present size. I do not see any necessity for printing these returns. The police inspectors throughout the colony obtain returns of stock, and a summary is published in the *Statistical Register*, which is all that is necessary. We do not require the name of the owner of

every head of stock in the colony. It seems to me that the object of the regulation and of the return is simply to magnify the office of the Stock Branch. We have too much of that sort of thing already. I do not think that I need say anything further. I have had placed in my hands one of the forms sent to owners of stock, with a memorandum stating that if a return is not received before a certain date a summons will be issued. That notice has been sent to a member of this House, who has paid no attention to it. Why has he not been summoned? I hope the Vice-President of the Executive Council will call the attention of the Attorney-General to the fact that there is a public official who threatens people with something, but does not carry it out. I shall not divide the House on the question; but if any hon. member chooses to do so I shall not object.

Mr. SALOMONS: May I be allowed to explain that it is the act 30 Victoria, No. 16, namely, Diseases in Sheep Act, which makes Sydney a sheep district.

Question resolved in the negative.

CITY OF GOULBURN GAS AND COKE COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Mr. CREED rose to move:

That this bill be now read the second time.

He said that the object of the bill was to enable the company to increase its capital from £10,000 to £50,000, in order to meet the requirements of the increasing population.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read the second time, and reported without amendment; report adopted.

FIRST READINGS.

The following bills were received from the Legislative Assembly, and read the first time:—

Assignees of Fire Insurance Policies Enabling Bill.

Mittagong Coal-mining Company's Railway Act Amendment Bill.

CROOKWELL ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH LAND SALE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Mr. JACOB rose to move:

That this bill be now read the second time.

He said that the object of the bill was to empower the trustees of two portions of

land which had been granted in the town of Crookwell for a Roman Catholic church and a presbytery respectively, and neither of which is suitable for the purpose, to sell them, and use the money for the erection of those buildings on a site that had been acquired in a more convenient situation.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read the second time, and reported with verbal amendments; report adopted.

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 15 June, 1887.

Adulteration of Food and Liquor: Public Health Bill—Adelaide Jubilee Exhibition—The Queen's Jubilee: Public Meeting—St. James' Parsonage Land Leasing Bill—Telegraph Lines—Appraisement of Runs, Forbes District—Third Readings—Closing of Theatres on Sundays—Adjournment (Closing of Theatres on Sundays)—Customs Duties Bill—Informal Petition—Patents Law Amendment Bill (second reading)—Jury Fees Bill—Hay Court-house (Site Acquisition) Bill (second reading)—Adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND LIQUOR: PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Dr. ROSS asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—(1.) Is it the intention of the Government, during the ensuing session of Parliament, to deal in a comprehensive manner with the question of a food and liquor adulteration bill, and to appoint qualified inspectors? (2.) Is it their intention also to introduce a public health bill?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—The measures which the Government already propose to bring in next session are numerous, and some of them very large. It is almost impossible to say now to what extent the Government can add to the measures already planned; but the importance of the bill to prevent the adulteration of food and liquor, and certainly the importance of a public health bill, are well understood and felt; and if we can include these measures we certainly shall.

ADELAIDE JUBILEE EXHIBITION.

Mr. SPEAKER reported the receipt of a letter from the Secretary of the Adelaide

[Mr. Jacob.

Jubilee Exhibition, inviting hon. members to attend the opening of the exhibition.

THE QUEEN'S JUBILEE: PUBLIC MEETING.

Mr. WALKER: I desire to ask the Colonial Secretary whether his attention has been drawn to the following circular: Loyal Orange Institution of New South Wales, Grand Lodge Office, Protestant Hall, Castlereagh-street, Sydney, 11 June, 1887.

Dear sir and brother,—Our beloved Queen has been grossly insulted by the ruffian secularists and others, who broke up last night's loyal meeting in the Town Hall. As Orangemen we must do our best to wipe out this black stain of disloyalty, and deal with the disloyal as they deserve. As loyal Orangemen, you are requested to attend the meeting to be held in the Exhibition Building next Wednesday evening. You will be admitted by password at the southern door, facing Cleveland-street. Come early, come all! Free speech for ever! God save the Queen!

E. D. MADGWICK, G.M.
T. JESSEP, D.G.M.
W. T. STANTON, G.S.
W. ROBSON, D.G.S.
N. J. MACKENZIE, G.T.

N.B.—All members meet at 6:30, or as soon after as convenient. Come if possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that I am bound to interrupt the hon. member. It appears to me that the question is not in accordance with the rule in "May" which says:

All questions should be limited as far as possible to matters immediately connected with the business of Parliament or administration.

It seems to me that the hon. member's question has nothing whatever to do with the business of Parliament or the administration of public affairs.

Mr. WALKER: With all due deference to your ruling, sir, I wish to show that my question has a direct connection with the administration of affairs. I wanted to ask the Colonial Secretary, having drawn his attention to the circular, whether it is his intention to take any steps to prevent the meeting being packed by a certain section of citizens to the direct infringement of the right of other portions of the community to attend that meeting.

Sir HENRY PARKES: I am not, and never was, an Orangeman, and I know nothing whatever about the circular. With regard to taking steps to prevent any section of the citizens attending the meeting, I shall take no such step, or trouble myself about it.