**ASSESSMENT ON STOCK ACT AMEND­MENT BILL 1865**

**House of Assembly, 13 June 1865, page 483**

Second reading

**The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS** moved the second reading of this Bill, and stated that it was introduced in accordance with the wish of the House. It appeared that some lessees of waste lands, partly through a misconstruction of the Act, had. neglected to make application for their leases within 12 months, as prescribed. The Government had intimated their willingness to place them in the same position as if they had done so, provided they petitioned the House on the matter. There were in all 13 leases in this position, and with respect to only five of them had petitions been presented, so that only five would be entitled to be placed on the schedule of the Bill. That, however, would be a matter for the House to determine, and he proposed not to take the measure out of Committee that day, but insert the schedule on some future occasion. There was one case in which the lessee had applied under the Act of last session to have his term extended to 14 years. This application was not complied with, as it appeared the run had been bought at auction, and the lessee had neglected to apply in proper time for the five years’ renewal. The Government would not insert this lease in the schedule without the approval of the House, which they would be able to give if they thought fit when the schedule was proposed.

The Hon. A. BLYTH supported the second reading. In doing so he wished to remark that there was no excuse for those parties who had neglected to make application in proper time. However, he had no desire to make them suffer severe punishment, and he would therefore support the insertion in the schedule of all leases where the tenants had taken the course which had been pointed out.

Mr. GLYDE asked whether the parties had any opportunity of knowing the valuation placed on their runs.

The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS believed the whole of the leases had not been valued. The Surveyor-General was in possession of the requisite information with respect to the others, but only in the cases of Messrs. Ragless, Dunn, and Macfarlane had the valuations been made known.

Mr. COLTON enquired if those who had petitioned the House were, acquainted with the new valuations.

The COMMISSIONER of CROWN LANDS said Messrs. Ragless and Dunn had petitioned, but Mr. Macfarlane had not.

The Bill was then read a second time.