before they plunged themselves into irretrievable debt. The point with them now was should they pass the second reading of the Bill, or should they delay it, which might mean the stopping of the Bill for this session, and a further dangerous delay in providing for the imperative necessity of giving to the city an assured supply of water. To throw over the opinons of an expert like Mr. Brown, and take upon themselves the responsibility of depending on flood waters for domestic uses was no light matter, although they knew that the most eminent specialists sometimes failed to grasp the entire position and give a wrong decision. If they delayed the Bill by the appointment of a Special or Royal Commission what more could be laid before hon. members than had been presented to them? Every possible objection had been brought forward by the Gawler-Barossa Committee and laid before hon. members in that and the other Chamber, and from what he could gather no other scheme than this would have the ghost of a chance to pass the other Legislature. The Barossa scheme was spoken favourably of as a separate scheme from that of a city supply, and the Gawler-Barossa Committee were everywhere commended for their zeal and patriotism in persistently advocating the scheme they sincerely believed would be the best in the interest of the colony; and they had much to justify their energy and patriotism, and deserved every consideration. The District Councils and the people along the route they proposed to supply were awakening to the advantages of a reliable water supply, and had petitioned them to consider their claims, which undoubtedly would receive due attention from that and the other Chamber. (Hear, hear.)

The Hon. J. BOSWORTH supported the amendment, and though he could scarcely find new matter to introduce into the debate he wished to emphasize one or two points. The cavalier and shameful manner in which Mr. Martin had been treated in shutting him out of the Barossa Commission alone entitled the subject to have more consideration. The sources of supply for the rival schemes were entirely different. One was a prolific country and the other barren. One must be crowded with gardens and farms, which would be kept up by strong manures, and the other would carry no population. All the rains would find their way through objectionable matter on the ground into a river, and typhoid germs had been found to travel for miles. The Barossa district was sparsely populated, consequently the water would not be subjected to the same impurities as Happy Valley. Another matter that should carry weight was that the district between Gawler and Kadina was almost waterless, and the District Council had petitioned for a better supply of water. The country in the watershed was auriferous, and chemicals would be used in the treatment of ores which would have an injurious effect on the water. He hoped the amendment would be carried, so that a more representative body should make further enquiries. (Hear, hear.)

The Hon. S. TOMKINSON said he had great objections to loan Bills, but he had never had much doubt as to the relative merits of the waterworks schemes in question. There was no doubt a further supply of water was urgently required as soon as it could be obtained. It had clearly been shown that there was some danger in delaying the scheme. (Hear, hear.)

On the motion of the Hon. A. A. KIRKPATRICK the debate was adjourned till October 8.

PLACES OF PUBLIC AMUSEMENT BILL.

In Committee. Schedule B. The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. Copley) said some objections had been raised and doubts expressed as to whether the Bill applied to the country. Clause 1 showed the Bill only applied to Adelaide unless there was a petition to extend it. To make this clearer he proposed to recommit and alter clause 8. First and second lines passed. Third line—"Concert-room and Lecture Hall." The Hon. J. J. DUNCAN asked how the charges had been made up. The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS said the Bill had been drawn up at the instance of the City Corporation, and no doubt the Town Clerk had a good deal to do with it, and was guided by the Acts of other countries. The Hon. W. HASLAM asked if the Bill applied to religious bodies. The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS did not think they would be brought under the Bill. The Hon. F. KRICHAUFF said it seemed to him that the Town Clerk wished to get high fees. The charges were too high. The Hon. R. C. BAKER agreed that the fees were too high. It was absurd that Lecture Halls, which were perhaps only used once a year, should be charged £12. There was the Democratic Club, for instance. That would have to pay the fee, but of course they could well afford it. (Laughter.) He was not sure that Lecture Halls should pay at all. The Hon. Dr. MAGAREY took the same view, and moved that the line should be struck out. Carried. Line 4—"Dancing saloons and skating rinks." The Hon. S. TOMKINSON asked whether fees were enacted at present and what they were. The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS said there was a law in force, and the annual licence-fee was £5, quarterly £2, and monthly £1, and 6s. for each night up to six nights. The Hon. R. C. BAKER said the Town Hall was used for dancing. Would that have to pay the fee of £7? (Hon. F. Krichauff—"That would go into their own pockets.") Well, take the German Club. The Hon. Dr. MAGAREY hoped the line would be carried. Dancing saloons were a curse, and should be heavily taxed. They had to obtain a licence. A large amount of mischief was done by them, and they should be discountenanced. They were worse than public-houses. The Hon. J. J. DUNCAN questioned whether the words would not apply to the Town Hall, and also could be made applicable to persons who went to the enormity of having a dance in a private house. He did not wish it to apply to the Town Hall. The Hon. W. COPLEY—It is not the wish of the Government to apply it to the Town Hall. The Hon. A. R. ADDISON said the clause required some definition. Country Institutes frequently let their halls for dances. Hon. W. COPLEY—It does not apply to the country. The question was whether it was open to the public. The PRESIDENT—If everybody can come in then it is. The Hon. R. C. BAKER said that if there was a charge for admission everybody would not be admitted. The matter required some definition. The Hon. J. J. DUNCAN asked for a definition of "public." The Hon. W. COPLEY said that the word meant everybody and anybody from the Governor downward. The Hon. Dr. MAGAREY said that then the Bill was useless. All that was necessary was to make it a close affair and evade the Bill. The PRESIDENT thought that skating rinks should be separated. The Hon. R. S. GUTHRIE had found that many Friendly Societies let their halls for private assemblies and quadrille classes, and under the Act those halls would be classed as dancing saloons. That would prevent the Friendly Societies letting their halls for dancing. Dancing saloons should be defined as places where dancing was carried on to the profit of the owner of the hall. In regard to skating rinks the fee need not be so high, but it was absolutely necessary that there should be some charge, so that the Corporation officials could see that there were proper exits in case of fire and disturbances. The Hon. Dr. MAGAREY said that clause 13 gave the Governor power to make exemptions. The Hon. R. C. BAKER pointed out that the clause did not refer to the schedule. Clause 12 said every Church must have a man with uniform and with the word "fire" on it in charge. The Bill was badly drafted. The Hon. F. KRICHAUFF thought that Athletic Halls should be exempt. The Hon. G. W. COTTON agreed with Mr. Guthrie. The Hon. A. M. SIMPSON said the best thing would be for the Government to bring in a new Bill. He moved—"That the Chairman leave the chair." Carried.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. Copley), in moving the second reading, referred to the necessity that appeared for its introduction. When the Bill was introduced into another place there were some additional provisos in it which had been struck out. The part which had been struck out would have been a beneficial one indeed. The Bill was to encourage the holders of land to make the best use of the property they had. Any one travelling about the country would see the difference between properties held on leasehold and freehold. As for freehold, he did not believe any other system would equal it, whether for private people or for the State (Hon. D. M. Charleston—"Perpetual leases.") That was one of the most impossible of fads, and never could be worked. If they could get perpetual leases at a fixed rent it was equal to freehold. The owner of land let out on perpetual leases wanted to get hold of the unearned increment—(Hon. D. M. Charleston—"Land tax would prevent that.")—and wanted a revision of the rent from time to time, so practically the perpetual lease was simply a lease from one revision of rent to the next. Freehold had worked well not only in this colony but in the other countries. The trouble in the past had been that at the termination of the leases the tenant had no right to the improvement which he had carried out when he was on the land. As the result of long terms of leases the tenant in all probability would make proper use of the land. His experience of tenants was that they endeavoured, especially when the leases were nearly run out, to get all they could out of the land without any regard to the state of the land when they left it. He knew some land owned by a Bank which wanted to sell it, and would not lock it up for a long period. They only let it for three years, and the object of the tenant was to get as much as he possibly could out of the land, regardless of the state of the place when he left. The tenant was afraid of increased rental being charged for the renewal of the tenancy owing to expenditure of his own labour and money. (Hear, hear.) That had been one of the causes of the very great trouble brought on in Ireland. In one part they had had tenants' rights for many years, and there had never been anything like the same dissatisfaction and trouble as in other parts. Until recent years there had never been a law on the subject in England, owing to the class of landlords, most of whom were wealthy and high-minded men, who never took advantage of tenants but assisted them in the making of improvements. In this colony there was a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of tenants, more especially those of the South Australian Company, who were the largest landholders in the colony in respect to agricultural lands. Those tenants had no claim for improvements carried out during the currency of the lease. He was not going to say a word against the South Australian Company as landlords, as he believed in many cases they had endeavoured to carry out their duties exceedingly well, and had not enforced the highest rental they could have got, while at the same time they had always chosen the best available men as tenants. The Company had refrained from giving long leases, and the more highly improved the holdings were the greater fear the tenants had of paying increased rental at the end of their tenancy. The Bill was intended to get over the difficulty, but while giving rights to the tenants it was not proposed to deal unfairly with landlords. It did not interfere with existing leases. The Bill was drawn on the lines of the Imperial Act, which had worked exceedingly well. While it would not injure the fair-minded landlord, it compelled the landlord who was inclined to be harsh to deal more fairly with the tenant. It would be found on examination that the landlord was protected against having to pay for extravagant or useless improvements. The tenant had to give notice of the improvements he wished to make, and payment would only be made on the value of the improvements to the incoming tenants. The rights of the landlord were protected in that he might object to improvements being made, and if he could not come to terms with the tenant the whole question would be referred to arbitration. Clause 5 intended to encourage the letting of leases on long tenancy, and the Bill would not apply to any one willing to give tenants over twenty-one years at a fixed rental. Under clauses 9 and 10 if an agreement was not come to the landlord might make improvements and charge tenants at the rate of 5 per cent. on the value. Clauses 13 to 19 provided for arbitration and settlement of disputes, making recourse to legal proceedings almost impossible. One would scarcely credit that the Bill had been drawn up by a lawyer. (Hon. R. C. Baker—"Arbitration is better for lawyers than legal proceedings. The costs are much bigger always.") The Bill fixed the fees of witnesses and solicitors. Part III. gave to the tenants right to sell holdings, but protected landlords against objectionable tenants. In subsection E, on receiving notice from the tenant that he wished to sell the holding the landlord might elect to purchase the tenancy for a consideration, or refer it to arbitration, and would be entitled to the same allowance as in Part II. in respect to tenant quitting holding on the termination of tenancy. An unusual feature of the Bill was that even the regulations for the working of the Bill were set out in it. He hoped the Council would pass the Bill in the form in which it was introduced. (Hear, hear.)

On the motion of the Hon. R. C. BAKER the debate was adjourned till October 7.

PAPERS.

The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. Copley) laid the following paper on the table:—Return to order of the Council (Hon. J. Darling)—Rates of Carriage of Ores in the various Colonies.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council at fifteen minutes to 6 adjourned till October 7, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6.

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. Coles) took the Chair at 2 o'clock.

GENERAL POST-OFFICE ADDITIONS.

Mr. GRAINGER asked whether the Attorney-General had brought down the papers referring to the purchase of land in connection with the erection of additions to the General Post-Office as he had promised to do. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. R. Homburg) said he promised on Wednesday last to bring down the papers, and he did so on the following day. As Mr. Lake was the only member who asked questions on the subject they were shown to him and returned. (Mr. Grainger—"I want to see them.") So long as the matter was in the hands of the Crown Solicitor he could not let the papers go out of his possession, but the hon. member might see the papers later on in the afternoon.

GOVERNMENT LAND TAXATION POLICY.

Mr. MOULE asked which of the four steps of the Government policy would be taken first. The TREASURER (Hon. T. Playford) said the first of the four steps that he proposed to deal with was the Land Repurchase Bill, after which the measure relating to the testamentary land subdivision would be considered. He hoped to take the first measure early next week, and if not then certainly the week after. The Government wished first to clear the Notice-paper somewhat. Mr. MOULE asked if the Premier would fix next Tuesday for the discussion of the taxation proposals. The Hon. T. PLAYFORD said that he could not do this very well, because the Government desired to push on the Commonwealth Bill, and have that settled one way or the other. (Mr. Grainger—"Let us settle the taxation proposals one way or the other.") The Government had no taxation proposals to settle. (Hon. Dr. Cockburn—"What?" Hon. Members—"Oh!" "Mr. Grainger—"What, another lapse of memory?") The hon. member knew what was meant. The proposals were not for the purpose of raising revenue, but for discouraging the accumulation of large estates. (Hon. Dr. Cockburn—"Don't you consider a resolution for a protectionist tariff a taxation resolution, though it may be intended not to increase the taxation through the Customs, but to encourage local production?") Mr. ASH asked whether the Premier did not think it advisable to facilitate the business of the country this session by postponing the four steps of the Government policy until next session. (Laughter.) Mr. MOULE said he understood that the Government would bring on the repurchase scheme first, and then the testamentary subdivision scheme, and considering the extreme probability of both these measures being defeated—(Oh, and Hear, hear.) The SPEAKER—The hon. member must please confine himself to the question, and not anticipate the result of debates. Mr. MOULE said he would ask, then, supposing that both these measures were defeated, would the Government go on with the further consideration of the resolutions relative to taxation of large estates. He had a contingent motion on the Paper, and as it dealt with taxation it ought to appear in connection with the Government resolutions and not as a private resolution. (Mr. Handyside—"Move a no-confidence motion.") The Hon. T. PLAYFORD said that if the repurchase and the testamentary subdivision schemes were not passed by the House the Government would not proceed with the taxation proposals referred to. He could not add anything to what he had said last week upon that point. Mr. GRAINGER asked if the Order of the Day referred to by Mr. Moule was not one of the resolutions in the taxation policy of the Government. The Hon. T. PLAYFORD said that, as he had previously explained, this was not a taxation proposal, because taxation proposals in the ordinary sense were for the purpose