

Act which has been in force in this State for a number of years, and we have also a Bankruptcy Act. Various bills of sale have come under the review of the Bankruptcy Court, and from the inquiries made and from the result of proceedings taken in the Court of Bankruptcy, it has been proved over and over again that under a bill of sale various creditors secure an undue advantage on account of a preferential security having been given under the provisions of the Bills of Sale Act. I remember one case well which came within my experience, where there was one creditor for £400 and other creditors amounting to £2,000.

MR. GORDON: Is that the only case you know of?

MR. FOULKES: It is the only case I can remember at the present moment. The creditor for £400 took the whole of the assets of this particular debtor, and all the other creditors were left out in the cold. All that this Bill, so far as I have seen it, will provide is that before a man can register a bill of sale he must give seven days' notice, and it means practically giving seven days' notice to his other creditors. I do not think that is a very great hardship on that man. He has certain obligations—

MR. GORDON: Not on that one man; but what about others who want money quickly?

MR. FOULKES: The hon. member says, what about others who want money quickly? I do not think there is very much hardship on them, and the rights of other creditors have to be considered.

MR. GORDON: Supposing he has not got any other creditors?

MR. FOULKES: I think it happens in most cases that when a man gives a bill of sale he is very hard pushed for money, and that he would be found to have more than one creditor. Any way, what I would recommend this House to do is to pass the second reading of this Bill, and postpone the Committee stage for, we will say, a month—[MR. GORDON: Bring down a new Bill]—so that the various commercial classes in this country may have full opportunity for discussion.

On motion by the PREMIER, debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9:51 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

## Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 24th July, 1906.

	PAGE
Ex-President's Retirement, Letter of Thanks	565
Questions: Railway Deviation, Wagin-Dumpleyung	566
Racecourse Behaviour, Police Control	566
Aborigine Trial, a Girl	566
Bills: Health Act Amendment, 1s.	566
Supply (two months), all stages	568
Prisons Act Amendment, 3s.	568
Fremantle Jockey Club Trust Funds, 3s.	568
Jury Act Amendment (majority verdict), 2s.	568
concluded	568
Collie and Esperance Rates Validation, 1s.	571
Return ordered: Agricultural Lands near Spur	566
Railways	566
Adjournment of House, a Fortnight	571

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. H. Briggs) took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

## PRAYERS.

## EX-PRESIDENT'S RETIREMENT.

## LETTER OF THANKS.

THE PRESIDENT said: I have received a letter from the late President of this House (Sir George Shenton) as follows:—

Crawley Park, Perth, 18th July, 1906.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th inst., forwarding me a copy of the resolution passed by the Legislative Council on the 26th of June. Will you please convey my sincere thanks to the members of the Legislative Council for their very kind expressions of regret that I have been compelled to retire from the Council and the office of President. I shall always look back with pleasure on the 16 years I spent in the Council. Fourteen of these years I had the honour of presiding over it. I trust my health will be so far restored as to still allow me to assist in such measures as may tend to the material progress and advancement of this State.—I have the honour to be, etc.

GEO. SHENTON.

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Special by-laws of Esperance Roads Board. By-laws of Guildford Municipality.

## QUESTION—RAILWAY DEVIATION, WAGIN-DUMBLEYUNG.

HON. M. L. MOSS asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is it a fact that an alteration in the route of the Wagin-Dumbleyung Railway from the present surveyed route known as the Tubs is being made? 2, If so, is it on the recommendation of Mr. Dartnall, the Engineer-in-Charge? 3, If not, on whose recommendation; and what is the reason of the alteration?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2 and 3, The deviation is adopted because the Engineer-in-Chief recommends this route as preferable from an engineering point of view. It is three-quarters of a mile shorter than the other route, and the present proposed grading of 1 in 40 could be reduced, if necessary, to 1 in 60, which could not be accomplished on the other route without considerable alteration and deviation. The route is also recommended by the Surveyor General from a Lands Department point of view.

## QUESTION—RACECOURSE BEHAVIOUR, POLICE CONTROL.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD asked the Colonial Secretary: In view of the tragedy on the Flemington Racecourse (Victoria) on the 14th inst., will the Government take steps, by introducing any necessary amendments to the law or laws relating to betting and the control of racecourses, by police protection or by other means, with the object of preventing any similar occurrence in this State?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: The Police Offences Bill, now before another place, deals with the matter. Ample police protection is already provided.

## QUESTION—ABORIGINE TRIAL, A GIRL.

HON. R. F. SHOLL (for the Hon. J. M. Drew) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, At the preliminary hearing of a charge of attempted murder brought against an aborigine girl at Northampton last month, was the prosecution conducted by counsel representing the Crown? 2,

What was the result of the hearing? 3, Did the Government arrange that the girl should be represented by counsel at the hearing? 4, Was she so represented? 5, If not, why not?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, The accused was committed for trial. 3 and 4, No. 5, The hearing was only a preliminary proceeding. The accused will be represented by counsel at the trial.

## BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and read a first time.

## RETURN—AGRICULTURAL LAND NEAR SPUR RAILWAYS.

HON. R. F. SHOLL (North) moved—

1, That a Return and plans be laid on the table of this House showing, in addition to the selected surveyed routes of the Katanning-Kojonup, Wagin-Dumbleyung, and Goomalling-Dowerin Railways—(a) The quantity of land already selected within a radius of 15 miles of these railways; (b) the names of selectors and dates of application; (c) the number of acres in each block so applied for; (d) the amount of land suitable for agricultural settlement still available within a 15-miles radius of each railway. 2, Also, that there be laid on the table a copy of the official report on the quality, etc., of the land that will be served by the respective lines, and its suitability for agricultural settlement.

This motion asked for information that should have been before members when authority was given at the close of last session for the expenditure of public money upon the construction of these railways. Members would now realise how unwise it was to enable any Government to pass one or more Railway Bills without getting every information, without having surveys and a previous examination as to the quality of the land for settlement. There was a rumour, true or untrue, that it was found after examination that one of these lines would not justify the expenditure.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was untrue.

HON. R. F. SHOLL was glad to hear it was untrue, because the Government should realise their responsibility. He was aware that at the end of last session there was strong sympathy in relation to the matter, there being a new Government in power. Members realised

that to promote the welfare of the country it was necessary to advance settlement of the land, and this House did on that occasion what he hoped it would never do again—sanctioned the expenditure of public money without getting sufficient information as to the quality of the land for settlement, the approximate cost after survey, and every information with plans laid on the table. A plan was laid on the table showing that a railway should run from A to B; just a line drawn across, without any surveys, and with a deviation of five miles either way, he thought. He desired to get all this information before the Loan Bill came down authorising the raising of money for these lines. What we wanted in building spur railways was to enable the people to settle on the soil and to bring their produce to market by rail, which could not otherwise be brought in at a remunerative price.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY** (Hon. J. D. Connolly) would not oppose the motion, but desired to point out that if it were passed it would incur perhaps some unnecessary expense, as this information was all given by the then Minister for Works (Hon. F. Wilson) when the Bills were introduced in the Assembly; and the information which the Government could give in the return now asked for would probably be only repetition. The then Government made themselves acquainted with all the settlement and the land available for settlement along the three railways, and the information was given to this House then, though perhaps not so fully as it was given in another place.

**HON. M. L. MOSS:** There were no surveys.

**HON. R. F. SHOLL:** No surveys.

**HON. J. W. HACKETT:** There was no information.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** Probably we did not get the information we perhaps had a right to expect, but he thought we had only a couple of hours in which to deal with these and other Bills.

**HON. J. W. HACKETT:** What did the present Colonial Secretary himself think?

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** At the time he thought we ought to have had more information, and he still was of that opinion. It was a very short

session. He recognised the importance of the thing, but all the same the information had been given in another place, and in his opinion this information could be obtained now by reading the *Hansaard* report of last session.

**HON. J. W. HACKETT:** The information was not given here.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** Some information was given to the Council.

**HON. W. KINGSMILL:** Exactly the same information was given in this House as in the other.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** The Government had no wish to oppose the motion, and as soon as the information could be obtained it would be laid on the table.

**HON. R. F. SHOLL** (in reply): When the matter came before this House there was absolutely no information given; there had been no survey of the land, and no examination of it as to quality. That was the information he was trying to obtain now. He wanted to get every information, which he hoped the House would insist on having in future before it sanctioned the expenditure of any money. If railways were to be built they should be built and sanctioned by Parliament, and the money should be voted after survey and after examination of the land. Members trusted the Government would build the lines if they were satisfactory after survey, and were proved suitable for settlement, and justified. They trusted that if the lines were not justified the Government would refrain from expending public money when they knew that similar lines were required which would be more justifiable.

**HON. W. MALEY:** Gold had been discovered there since.

**HON. R. F. SHOLL:** Agricultural lines were not goldfield lines. Both the Colonial Secretary and the Honorary Minister were in the House last session, and they knew how these Bills were passed by the House in good faith. He would have thought that the Government should have all this information prepared, and would have brought down the reports of the surveyors and the officials who examined the country, without the necessity of a motion for this return. The Government did not seem

to take the House into their confidence at all.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** The hon. member was mistaken in that view.

**HON. R. F. SHOLL:** As to the statement by the Colonial Secretary that we obtained the same information as was given in the other House, the Government themselves had no information at the time. There had been no examination of the land, and it was not even surveyed, so how could the Government have given the information?

**HON. J. W. HACKETT:** And there was not a word about the increment.

**HON. R. F. SHOLL:** No. The Government would, he hoped, give every information and determine this question openly and as widely as possible, and furnish the return.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** That would be done. The Government had no wish to evade it at all. They would give the fullest information.

**HON. R. F. SHOLL:** The Government should give a report on the country and the revenue likely to be derived from the lines, before this House voted the money for them.

Question put and passed.

#### SUPPLY BILL. ALL STAGES.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

Standing Orders suspended, to allow the remaining stages to be taken at one sitting.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly)** in moving the second reading said: I do not think it is necessary to make any remarks on this measure, which speaks for itself. This is the usual course adopted. Before the Estimates are passed the expenditure has to be met in the ordinary way; therefore it is necessary to bring down a Supply Bill, and this is a Supply Bill which, as the title indicates, is for the amount of £564,748. This amount will cover two months' supply, July and August. By that time we hope to have the Estimates introduced and dealt with in another place, and that there will be no necessity for a farther Supply Bill. I beg to move the second reading.

**HON. M. L. MOSS (West):** I rise only to congratulate the Government on

having asked for Supply so soon after the commencement of the year. Mr. Sholl and other members of this House have previously condemned the practice of spending money for two or three months in the financial year, and then coming afterwards for the ratification by Parliament. The present Bill is a proper procedure, and I hope that Governments in the future will follow this new practice. Parliament was called together before the end of the financial year, and thus early in the year we are asked to grant supply. I think the Ministry are deserving of considerable commendation for taking this course, and I hope, as I have said, that Governments in the future will obtain parliamentary approval before spending money. I think this is a very good precedent.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE, ETC.

Bill passed through the remaining stages without debate or amendment.

#### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

(1) Prisons Act Amendment, (2) Fremantle Jockey Club Trust Funds, read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

#### BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

##### MAJORITY VERDICT.

##### SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from the 17th July; **HON. W. KINGSMILL** in charge of the Bill.

**HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East):** I am sure the principle of the Bill before the House is a good one, and if a Bill on its lines be passed it will tend to command respect, as at present there is a considerable amount of time wasted by those who are concerned in civil trials. The only point that strikes me as doubtful in the Bill is that a two-thirds majority is too small. I would rather increase the proportion to five-sixths for a jury of six, because you cannot make three-fourths out of six jurymen.

**HON. W. KINGSMILL:** What about three-fourths out of a jury of twelve?

**HON. S. J. HAYNES:** When there are twelve, yes; but not where six try a case. If the Bill passes in its present form, from

my slight experience of juries I think it will have a detrimental effect unless that proportion is increased. I intend to move in Committee, if no other members does, that the words providing for a two-thirds majority be struck out and "five-sixths" inserted instead. The effect of that will be that in juries of six, five men must agree on a verdict; and in the case of twelve jurors, the proportion required to agree would be ten. I think that will be a more reasonable and more satisfactory proportion than the one proposed in the present Bill. I also think it right, as I understand one member said, that the principle should be applied to criminal cases also; and as I have said, the proportion should be increased to ten out of twelve jurors. I will give two instances which have come under my notice this year. The first was a criminal case, the stealing or broaching of brandy, and the evidence was fairly clear to me as the prosecuting counsel, though I cite this case without prejudice. The case was a difficult one to prove, and one which, if proved, would require an exemplary punishment. The jury retired at 6 o'clock, and after being locked up till 10 or 11 o'clock they had to be discharged because unable to agree; and the next day a fresh jury was empanelled to try the case. Although what occurs in a jury is considered to be secret, I heard afterwards on good authority that as soon as the jury retired, one of the twelve took off his boots and declared, "I am not going to bring in a verdict against him." I heard afterwards that this man had himself been discharged from employment for a similar thing, stealing or broaching brandy, but unfortunately he had not been brought before the court. Another instance occurred quite recently, in a case where a Chinaman was charged with a serious offence. I heard afterwards that in this case one of the jurymen said, "I am not going to acquit this Chinaman." That juror was so prejudiced against the Chinese as a race that he would not even take a cup of tea because it was supposed to have been brewed by a Chinaman in an hotel in the locality. These and other such cases show how the vagaries, or worse, of one or two jurors in a case may put the State to considerable expense in obtaining a second trial. I think that a majority

verdict of five-sixths for jury trials would be a good addition to the statute-book, that it would minimise expense and tend to farther the ends of justice. I support the second reading, and perhaps in Committee some member will move in the direction I have indicated.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East): I think the Bill is a good one so far as its preparation is concerned; but the effect it will have in civil trials cannot be anticipated with certainty, in the absence of experience as to the working of this departure from the good old British system that has been in vogue from time immemorial. Whether the departure will be good or not, time only can prove. The principle embodied in the Bill has been tried in New South Wales; but where circuit courts are established to deal with civil cases in small towns in this sparsely populated State, and with the present system of summoning jurors, it is quite possible that in a small town there may be on a jury several persons in practically the same position and having perhaps the same common name; so that a three-fourths verdict might be given by a clan of Murphys, a clan of Smiths, or a clan of McGregors. I was recently informed of a family in a small town which numbered no fewer than twenty-six persons, all bearing the same common name; and I venture to say that out of these twenty-six people the chances are two-thirds belonging to the one family would be on a jury. In making these departures we must be careful they are made for the public good and that the result will not be disastrous. I shall support the second reading, and the matter can be dealt with more fully in Committee.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD (Metropolitan-Suburban): The proportions mentioned in the Bill are not quite the same as those in the Bill which was before the Council some three or four years ago, and I really think the proportions mentioned on the previous occasion are preferable to those mentioned now. They were, in the case of a jury of 12 three-fourths, and in the case of a jury of six five-sixths of the whole. That might meet the objection that Mr. Haynes has to the proportions, and no doubt the clause will be amended. I think it would be in the interests of justice to pass the Bill into law. The

information we had from several speakers at the last sitting of the House, that there was to some extent tampering with a jury, would by this amendment be rendered more difficult, because under the present system it is only necessary to get hold of one jurymen and urge him to stick out against a conviction; but in the proposed alteration it would be necessary to get hold of more than one man if there was any wish to tamper with a jury. I shall support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. W. KINGSMILL (in reply as mover): I have to thank members for their kindly reception of this little Bill and for the kindly criticism which they have bestowed on it. Mr. Moss in his speech was the most trenchant of my critics, and he admitted that it was not because the Bill was faulty, but that it did not go as far as he wished. He impeached the panel system now in vogue in Western Australia, and rightly so too; but it was unkind of the member to refer to the Bill as an attempt to patch up the parent measure. No one made a similar remark to the member when introducing a small amending Bill last session, and I as one of his colleagues could not of course draw his attention to the fact. I felt hurt at that remark on this measure. As to the proportions and the majority before a verdict can be taken, I shall accept the suggestion made by Mr. Langsford, of three-fourths of a jury of twelve and five-sixths of a jury of six. This is the law practically throughout the States that have adopted the majority verdict, and I am satisfied it should be adopted in this case. With regard to the remarks made as to the necessity for amending the method of empanelling juries, I am at one with Mr. Moss in his criticism of the measure, but everything cannot be obtained by the method of empanelling pointed out. I wish to refer to a concrete case of tampering with a jury which was cited by Mr. Purkiss when introducing his Bill in 1902, and which had occurred during the trial of a case. I may point out that whatever jury may be empanelled a process such as this cannot be averted. While I do not claim for the Bill that it will carry out all amendments needed to the Jury Act, still it is a step in the right direction, and will do away with a great deal of the opprobrium which at present attaches to trial by jury in civil

cases. Again, I thank members for the support they have given to the Bill.

HON. F. CONNOR (North): I shall have to move a very material alteration to one of the clauses of the Bill when in Committee, not because I disagree with the principle of the measure, but I want to go a step farther in order to make it possible for the trial of civil cases to be taken from a jury and put into the hands of a Judge of the Supreme Court, with appeal to the Full Court. Although I am not speaking as a legal authority on the question, I am speaking with authority almost as good as a legal one, that is the authority of experience of what juries will do in civil cases when they have the power. I have watched the procedure in the Supreme Court, and I have seen six men well and truly sworn take their seats and for six days listen to the arguments of counsel and to the evidence placed before them by witnesses for and against, and I have never seen one of these jurymen make a single note. I would ask members, what knowledge can these jurymen have of the merits or demerits of the case? Most of them are asleep all the time, and when it comes to a question whether or not the plaintiff or defendant is right they simply give their ideas, knowing very little about the whole affair. [Interjection.] Sympathy is too sacred a word to make use of in connection with this argument. I hold that verdicts given by men in such circumstances as I have described should not occur. The trouble is this, that if a jury decide, even against the instruction of the Judge who presides, on a question of fact, there is no appeal: the only appeal against a wrongful verdict, which is often given, is on a question of law. If a jury decide a question of fact, the Supreme Court will seldom upset that decision. It will be in the interest of justice that trial by jury in civil cases should be done away with, and that cases should be heard by a competent Judge. It is not only the question of the verdict, but the question of costs is practically decided by the jury. I have known a case in which a jury was practically unanimous except for one man. The jurors thought that there was no case against the defendant; but one man was stubborn and said, "I will sit here as long as possible until you come to a verdict for

the plaintiff." The question of the poor man and the rich man comes in: you will find there is more sympathy with the poor man than with the rich man. A verdict may be nominal, but it carries costs, and the costs in most of these cases are of a greater amount than the verdict. That is a condition of things that should not be controlled by some irresponsible jurymen. I have spoken in another place on this question very forcibly because I feel most strongly, and I have not changed my opinions since that time. I will not say there is injustice, perhaps that is too strong, but there are anomalies. Irresponsible men do not know what to decide on, but on sympathy they give a verdict one way or the other. I apologise to the member who moved the second reading of this Bill for speaking after he has replied, but I only came into the Chamber, just as he was speaking, and I did not know what had been said about the Bill. I do not wish the member to think I have any antagonism to the measure, because I have not. I am in sympathy with the Bill so far as it goes; but I want to go a step farther and do away with what I call an injustice, trial by jury.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### BILL—COLLIE AND ESPERANCE RATES VALIDATION.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

#### ADJOURNMENT, A FORTNIGHT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving that the House at its rising do adjourn for a fortnight, said it would probably be agreeable to country members if we adjourned for a fortnight, by which time he anticipated there would be sufficient business from the Assembly to put before members and enable them to put in a full week's work. That would be better than asking members to come back to-morrow and for one day next week.

HON. F. CONNOR (North): The Council should not adjourn for a fortnight. There was nothing to prevent some business being brought down before that time. After having sat for two days at the opening of Parliament the Council

adjourned for three weeks; then we adjourned for a fortnight, and now we met on one day for an hour and were to adjourn for another fortnight. The country would wonder what we were here for. He would not oppose the motion, but it would be much better if some work were brought down for the House to start on. Work should be initiated which members could transact. There should not be continual adjournments. Without wishing to oppose the motion he suggested that it would be better for the Council to meet this day week at latest, and that some work should be initiated in this House.

HON. R. F. SHOLL (North) agreed with the remarks of Mr. Connor. The House had met for the transaction of business, and without any reason having been given by the Colonial Secretary, a motion was moved that the House should adjourn for a fortnight. If the Colonial Secretary would say that owing to the long speeches made in the Lower House on the Address-in-Reply, the Government had been unable to get on with business and were consequently not in a position to send on work for this Chamber to do, the country would know who was to blame. We were continually hearing people say "What is the use of the Legislative Council—they do no work; they simply meet for an hour, and then adjourn for a fortnight?" It should be made known that the reason for these adjournments was that no work had been sent on by the Legislative Assembly for this House to deal with. Surely some Bills could have been introduced in this House by the Government. It was not wise for this House to adjourn for a fortnight; and he moved an amendment on the motion—

That the House at its rising do adjourn till this day week.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East): It was generally known that the necessity for a lengthy adjournment arose from the fact that recriminations had been going on in another place, which kept business back. For the House to adjourn for a fortnight, as now proposed, would be the strongest protest we could raise to the recriminations indulged in by members of another place.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (speaking on the amendment): It was not a question whether the House was

prepared to meet to-morrow or next week. He had moved to adjourn for a fortnight in deference to the wishes of country members. Mr. Sholl and Mr. Connor lived in town; but some of the country members—Mr. Haynes, for example—had to travel over 300 miles to attend the sittings of the House; and it would be unfair to bring them so far for a day's sitting, when by adjourning for a fortnight sufficient business could be brought forward to occupy the succeeding week.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: It would be all rush, then.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not the fault of the Government that Bills were not down from another place. Members were well aware there had been a long debate in another place on the Address-in-Reply, covering three weeks. He did not agree with the suggestion of Mr. Connor that this House should justify its existence by indulging in a lot of talk, perhaps recriminations, as was done in the Assembly.

HON. F. CONNOR had not suggested that.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It had been mentioned that some Bills might have been initiated in this Chamber; but he reminded members that the Government came into office only a few weeks before Parliament met, and had since been giving attention to the legislation intended for the session. He had given notice of three or four small Bills since this House assembled; and members knew that only a small portion of the Bills in the Government programme could be initiated in this House. When Bills had originated in this Chamber in the earlier months of a session, those Bills on reaching the Assembly were placed at the bottom of the Notice Paper, and nothing farther was heard of some of them. Personally, he was prepared to meet the House to-morrow, or next week; but he did not think it fair to country members to bring them here for a short sitting, when by adjourning for a fortnight there was a prospect of having a full week's work in front of members.

HON. M. L. MOSS (West): Copies of any Bills which might pass the Lower House between the adjournment and the time of the reassembling of this House might well be supplied to members for

their perusal. There was a considerable amount of legislation coming forward, and if his suggestion were acted upon members of this House might familiarise themselves with and consider those measures before being asked to discuss them here. Some of the measures were comprehensive in character, and his suggestion would tend to the more speedy transaction of business.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY had intended doing that, and it was done in former years.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan) thanked the Leader of the House for bearing in mind that it was unfair to members of the House to ask them to attend for only one day when there was no likelihood of more business being ready. The better course would be, as suggested, to have a longer adjournment so that there might be work provided for the House on its reassembling. Members were desirous of giving time and attention to matters which came before the House, but most of those matters had to come here from another place. It was open to Mr. Connor, if he chose, to bring in half a dozen Bills, which members might consider.

Amendment (Mr. Sholl's) by leave withdrawn.

HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East): Speaking as a country member, he thought it was only just to those who came here from distant places that they should not be asked to travel very long distances unless there was a quantity of business to be done. He had travelled 350 miles to attend the present sitting, and although he was prepared always to attend to his duties, it was hard that he should find, after travelling that distance, there was practically no business to be done. The reason for the proposed adjournment was patent to everybody. The whole of three or four weeks had been wasted in another place in personal recriminations, with the result that practically no business had been completed and forwarded for this House to deal with.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 5:42 o'clock until Tuesday, 7th August.

---