On motion by the PREMIER, consideration of the message made an order for the next sitting.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until 3·30 o'clock to-morrow.

MR. A. E. THOMAS: While desiring to help the Premier in every possible way to facilitate the business of the country, he wished to enter his protest against the procedure adopted by the Premier in asking the House to postpone the business of the country until to-morrow afternoon. There was plenty of time this evening to carry on the business, and there was plenty of business on the paper to go on with. As a country member, he wished to enter his protest against this adjournment. On the 23rd December, after two weeks of continuous sitting from 11 o'clock in the morning until 1 or 2 o'clock on the following morning, the Opposition sat patiently listening to members of the Government wasting the time of the House in talking needlessly on various subjects. An arrangement had been arrived at that members should do their utmost to finish the business of Parliament and prorogue before the Christmas holidays; but through the attitude adopted by the Hon. J. W. Hackett in another place, such proceeding could not be carried out. Members were consequently brought back after Christmas, and it was presumed the Government intended then to go on with the business of the country. Those members who resided in the country had objected to sitting so close to Christmas; but a reasonable postponement of the business was not then granted. And now, instead of bringing back members from Cue, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Albany, Bunbury, and other distant places, to find the Government did not intend to go on with the business, it would have been better if country members had been wired to, stating that only formal business would be gone on with to-day, instead of being brought back on Tuesday and their time wasted in this way.

*Question put and passed.*

THE PREMIER: In moving that the House do now adjourn, it would be wrong if he did not, on behalf of the House, express to the member for Dundas the thanks and pleasure of members for his instructive and interesting remarks about the weather.

Question passed.

The House adjourned at 8·42 o'clock, until the next afternoon at 3·30.

# Legislative Council,

*Wednesday, 13th January, 1904.*



THE ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. H. Briggs) took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITION—VOTING TO BE COMPULSORY.

THE HON. J. W. WRIGHT presented a petition from Mr. F. L. Weiss, praying for a clause to be enacted to enforce the exercise of the franchise at elections. This petition was the outcome of a recent election, and followed closely on another petition presented to the House a short time ago. It expressed his (Mr. Wright's) view of the case, though perhaps not so drastically; for as the State had a duty to perform to the elector in enfranchising him, the elector had also a duty to perform to the State by voting when possessed of the franchise; and any elector who failed to exercise his vote at an election should be fined, unless he gave a really just excuse, such as illness, or absence from the State, or inability to attend and record his vote. Any elector so neglecting to vote should be disfranchised for the next election.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT: The hon. member should present the petition. This was not the time to make a speech on the subject.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT moved that the petition be received.

Question passed.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT had intended to move that the petition be read, but owing to its importance he moved that it be printed.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT: The hon. member had better propose that the petition be read, so that members might have an opportunity of seeing whether it ought to be printed or not.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT moved that the petition be read.

Question passed, and the petition read.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: As it appeared to be against the wish of the House that the petition be printed, he moved that it do lie on the table.

Question passed.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, leave of absence for one fortnight granted to the Hon. J. M. Drew, on the ground of urgent private business.

## GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS BILL.

Read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

## FACTORIES BILL.

### AMENDMENTS.

The Council having amended the Bill, and the Assembly agreeing to 24 amendments and not agreeing to 12, also amending three others, the Assembly's message was now considered in Committee.

No. 3—Clause 2, page 2, line 5, strike out "two" and insert "six." Farther amendment made by the Assembly—Strike out "six" and insert "four" in lieu:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In the Assembly's farther amendment, the question of the number that would constitute a factory arose, and this was one of the principal points on which the Assembly appeared to disagree with the recommendations of the Council. When the Bill was before this House he accepted an amendment that 6 in lieu of 2 should constitute a factory; therefore it became his duty to move that the farther amendment of the Legislative Assembly be not agreed to. That would have the effect of leaving in the word "six" in lieu of "four" which the Assembly proposed should be inserted.

Question passed, the Assembly's farther amendment not agreed to.

No. 13—Clause 19, strike out the whole. Farther amendment made by the Assembly—Strike out the words "the whole," and insert Subclauses (2) and (3) in lieu:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Assembly's farther amendment be agreed to. The effect of this would be to strike out Subclauses 2 and 3, and leave in Subclause 1. By Subclause 1, inspectors would be appointed under the Factories Act to see that the awards of the Conciliation and Arbitration Court were carried out. He did not think any harm could be done by adopting this. The Assembly had agreed to the striking out of Subclauses 2 and 3, which contained what was to some people the objectionable part of the clause.

HON. G. RANDELL: It was for members to say whether they would have this unnecessary, and in his opinion impracticable, clause in the Bill. The Conciliation and Arbitration Act was complete in itself, providing for the carrying out of its decrees. This was an important clause, and was objected to very strongly on the part of owners of factories.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Large factories?

HON. G. RANDELL: Yes. He had the information from the president and secretary and also one individual member of the Chamber of Manufactures, who represented the opinion of that Chamber.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: The largest manufacturers did not belong to that body.

HON. G. RANDELL: A very considerable number belonged to it. He had met with them on several occasions.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was only one manufacturer of any importance in the Chamber.

HON. G. RANDELL: At any rate the manufacturers were strongly opposed to

the clause. On a previous occasion the opinion was strongly expressed that this clause should not remain in the Bill. From the beginning he had been instructed to object to the insertion of this clause, which was almost persecuting in its tendency, and was certainly unnecessary in view of the completeness of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and the ability of the board to carry out its own judgments. The only other amendments to which he objected were those relating to the definition of "boy," and the number constituting a factory.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: To his mind, this provision would, if introduced, necessitate a revision of the measure. To hand these powers over to the inspectors under this measure would be to strike a blow at the principle of arbitration as well as at the Factories Bill itself. There was not a manufacturer in the whole State who would not heartily condemn this Bill, if this clause was to prevail. If this clause were carried out, every manufacturer would, in regard to his establishment and employees, be absolutely at the mercy of the inspector and any couple of honorary justices who might happen to sit on the bench. We knew the class of inspector who would be commonly appointed under the Act: estimable gentlemen, but certainly not those entitled to push their way into a factory and take the steps he was now going to describe. The inspector could ask for every man, woman, child, and apprentice employed in the factory to be brought before him; and he could examine them on their relations with the employer, questioning them as to every sixpence of wages earned and as to every half-hour of their employment; he could put them through an absolutely inquisitorial investigation, while the employer could only stand by helplessly, seeing perhaps discord and disunion sown between himself and his employees. A delicate operation of that kind was surely not to be entrusted to the inspectors under this Act. It should be left to the administrators of the Arbitration Act. If we insisted on adopting this clause we should jeopardise the working of the Arbitration Act, and the whole body of industrial workers would rise up against us. Employers did not want the Arbitration Act administered by justices of the peace. There was already a tribunal presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court with whom employers were content to deal, and with nobody else if they could help it. The House should stand firm in its rejection of the clause.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: What was the good of the Aribtration Act if it were not administered?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: This clause had nothing to do with the Arbitration Act. The provisions of the Arbitration Act should be confined to that Act, and the provisions of a Factory Act should be confined to a Factory Act. The principle of the Arbitration Act would be brought into imminent jeopardy by this attempt to bring its provisions under the Factories Bill.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Members, in dealing with this clause, persisted in viewing it from one point of view alone. The award of the Arbitration Court was binding equally on the employer and the employee, and the duty of the inspector was not limited to a detection of breaches of an award on the part of the employer alone, for he had also to protect the employer and detect any breaches of an award on the part of the employee. One was sorry the Bill was so ill received by a body of gentlemen who, he thought, did not wholly represent the manufacturers of Western Australia—the W.A. Chamber of Manufactures. So far as he could see, none of the larger factory owners were members of that body; but undoubtedly the hostility of that body to the measure, ably voiced by Mr. Randell, was undeniable. He was sorry this should be so, because it would almost appear that some of the provisions of the Bill were being infringed, and nobody had argued that the provisions were evil. He hoped that was not the case, and that members would accept the Assembly's farther amendment.

Question negatived, the Assembly's farther amendment not agreed to.

No. 32—Assembly's farther amendment agreed to.

No. 2—Clause 2, Definition of "boy," strike out "sixteen" and insert "fourteen":

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Council's amendment be not insisted on. He asked members to

reconsider the action they took on a previous occasion when they altered the age from 14 to 16. One of the principal objects of the Bill was to protect the growing youth of both sexes, and to do so we should protect them up to the age of 16 years.

HON. G. RANDELL: The House on a previous occasion felt that it was undesirable to prevent boys from 14 to 16 years of age obtaining employment, and that in the interests of parents it was highly necessary that such boys should get employment. Should the amendment not be insisted on some boys would waste two of the best years of their lives. We should not have a statute interfering with the duty of parents and employers towards children, but it was already laid down stringently in the Bill that boys under 14 could not be employed unless there was a certificate from the inspector that he permitted the boy to be employed in special circumstances, so long as the inspector did not violate the principle of the Education Act in doing so; and with this limitation he (Mr. Randell) heartily concurred. Boys under 16 were capable of adding to the income of a family, and in the circumstances of the State every person over 14 should be able to contribute to the support of his family, and no Act should be passed to prohibit their doing so. In the New Zealand and South Australian Acts there were parallel descriptions of a child, defining as a child a boy or girl under 13 years of age. In the New Zealand Act there was a provision for doctors' certificates being obtained in certain cases; but there was no parellel to the provision in our Bill so far as he could discover. An inspector was certainly not the proper person to give a certificate; but to obtain a certificate from a medical man involved expense to parents. The provision proposed to be reinserted in the clause was an unnecessary and unjustifiable interference with the rights of parents and employers. There were plenty of other provisions in the Bill to prevent anything like injury being done to young people, and there were many boys under 16 years of age able to do a day's work as well as young men of 21 or 22, though they perhaps lacked the endurance. Members should adhere to their previous decison.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Would this allow boys over fourteen joining unions? That was the point.

HON. G. RANDELL did not think so. It was only anxiety on the part of the Government to protect the health of young people.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member was not anxious to protect the health of young people?

HON. G. RANDELL: The health of young people was supposed to be protected by parents. If restrictions were laid down in regard to boys in factories, why were not restrictions laid down in regard to boys in offices? In passing through the public offices the other day he met a young lad in the passage between the Colonial Secretary's office and the Lands Department. He asked the boy, who might have been between 10 and 12 years of age, if he was in the service, and the boy said he was. We should carry out the principle proposed to be adopted in this Bill in other ways, and make it obligatory everywhere that boys should get certificates before they could get employment There were plenty of unhealthy employments. The Government should be more anxious about the health of the public service. The Land Titles Office was not fit to be an office for the transaction of business, as there was neither light nor ventilation. He had gone to pay a telephone subscription into an office which was like a cellar. The people there were in the most stuffy atmosphere he could imagine, and he felt at the time inclined to go away without paying his subscription, and escape that atmosphere.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member started out on the wrong assumption that the provision was to prohibit the employment of boys under 16. That was not so, and the hon. gentleman must know it. Boys could be employed, but their employment was restricted to certain work and to certain conditions. The hon. member alluded to the anxiety of the Government to protect the health of the growing youth of the State. That was correct, but it was regrettable that anxiety was not shared by the hon. gentleman. With regard to its being the duty of parents to do this

and that, the principle could not be recognised. For instance, the hon. member might refer to the Education Act. It was the duty of parents to send boys and girls to school, but we did not leave the control of this matter to the parents. The hon. gentleman knew we could not do so, and that statutory power was given to the Education Department to deal with those parents whom the hon. member advised us to trust with the matter of regulating the employment of children in factories. The anxiety to protect the growing youth of the State was a laudable one, and the age of 16 should be adhered to. No notice should be taken of the argument for leaving the matter to the parents.

HON. G. RANDELL: We had left it to the parents for the last 60 years.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There were plenty of things which had arisen during the last 60 years and proved very useful. For instance the telephone was not used 60 years ago, and the hon. gentleman's admiration of the past did not prevent his making use of the advantages of modern science. He (the Colonial Secretary) disclaimed any knowledge of a youth of tender years being employed in his office. There was no youth under 14 employed in his department, and if he could prevent it there would be no youth under 14 employed in any other department unless in special cases. So far as he was able to carry out the Act, he would do so in that respect. He hoped members would stick to 16, and not be carried away by the arguments of Mr. Randell for the purpose of inserting 14 in lieu.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The tendency of keeping boys away from ordinary work until 16 years of age was to make them lazy. He did not suppose many boys underwent a stronger strain in their early years than he did. From the time he was a little over 12½ he was employed at pretty hard work for from 12 to 16 hours a day, and he did not know he was a particularly delicate man at the present time, so that work under 14 years of age did not hurt him. A great number of boys were healthier and stronger if they were fairly employed from 14 than they would be if they were kept from employment and were going to school or playing truant half the time.

HON. R. LAURIE: Those who would be affected by the alteration were not people who could afford to keep their children until the age of sixteen, but those who could not afford to keep them, particularly boys, groping around the house from the age of 14 to 16; and to fix the age at 16 would be to make these people work for a boy two years longer than they should. Parents, particularly working men, should have the right to let their boys go to work at the age of 14, if they wished to do so. A boy between 14 and 16 was at about that time of life when he was more likely to go wrong or right, as the case might be, and, if he could have something to do, that would give him more chance of going right than he would otherwise have.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Why should not a boy attend school?

HON. R. LAURIE: Many boys in this State and others were at 14 clever enough to be clear of all the education at the State schools. It was better to let a boy of 14 help his father, who had been working for him for 13 or 14 years, than to keep the boy at school simply for the sake of his being at school.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: To fix the age at 14 would be to inflict great loss on the working class population. Mr. Loton had pointed out his own experience, and had come out of the mill in a very good state of preservation. As to the lengthy hours with which Mr. Loton had to contend, boys were protected under this Bill by Clause 20. Instead of fixing the age at 14 being an evil, it would be a blessing.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: Year after year boys under 16 had been engaged at healthy employment down south, and if the age under the Act were fixed at 16 such boys would be thrown out of work, because the places would come under the meaning of factory. The most dangerous time for a boy who had left school to be loafing about the streets was when he was from 14 to 21. Moreover, many parents could not afford to keep boys after those boys were 14 years of age; indeed, it took them all their time to keep going till the boys reached 14.

Question negatived, the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 5 (consequential)—insisted on.

No. 6—not insisted on.

Nos. 15, 16, 17—insisted on.

No. 21—not insisted on.

No. 22—Clause 30, line 6, strike out "local" and insert "central":

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was going to be some difficulty over this divided jurisdiction; but in order to meet the reasons set forth, he moved that the amendment be not insisted on.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: Certain factories being outside the jurisdiction of any local board, why not add "Central or Local Board"?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That, he thought, went without saying.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: It did in the ordinary Health Act, but he did not know whether it would be so in this case.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Question passed, the amendment not insisted on.

No. 24 (consequential)—not insisted on.

No. 25—Clause 40, Subclause 1, strike out paragraph (*c*):

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the amendment be not insisted on. It dealt with the question of remuneration.

HON. G. RANDELL: This was a strong point made by members in regard to the Bill. It was undesirable to have the provision inserted, and he hoped members would adhere to their previous expression of opinion in regard to it. It was unfair, unjust, and improper to have the words inserted.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY was rather disappointed at the attitude of Mr. Randell, more especially after what the hon. gentleman had told him privately.

HON. G. RANDELL: The Colonial Secretary spoke to him rather suddenly with regard to this amendment, and he (Mr. Randell) said there were two or three amendments which he strongly favoured, and that with regard to the most of them he did not care much.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member said two amendments.

HON. G. RANDELL: The Colonial Secretary should not have understood that. Such was not the impression he intended to convey.

HON. E. McLARTY: When the matter was previously before the House he supported Mr. Randell, because he understood that there was no sweating in Perth. Since that time, however, facts had been brought to his knowledge convincing him that sweating or something very near to it did exist, and he certainly thought it was the duty of the House to protect people who were employed in earning a living by working long hours for insufficient remuneration.

HON. G. RANDELL: The hours were fixed.

HON. E. McLARTY: Not in the case of piece-work. Work was given out at starvation prices, and women had to work 12 hours or even longer to obtain a bare subsistence. He would now support the motion of the Colonial Secretary.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ayes | ... | ... | 9 |
| Noes | ... | ... | 10 |
| Majority against | ... | | 1 |

| AYES. | NOES. |
|---|---|
| Hon. E. M. Clarke | Hon. G. Bellingham |
| Hon. J. W. Hackett | Hon. A. Dempster |
| Hon. A. G. Jenkins | Hon. C. E. Dempster |
| Hon. W. Kingsmill | Hon. S. J. Haynes |
| Hon. R. Laurie | Hon. Z. Lane |
| Hon. E. McLarty | Hon. W. T. Loton |
| Hon. B. C. O'Brien | Hon. W. Maley |
| Hon. J. A. Thomson | Hon. G. Randell |
| Hon. J. D. Connolly (*Teller*). | Hon. J. E. Richardson |
| | Hon. J. W. Wright (*Teller*). |

Question thus negatived, the amendment insisted on.

No. 26—Clause 40, strike out Subclause 3:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This was also a part of Clause 40, and provided that the occupier of a factory should be deemed to have committed a breach of the Act by knowingly letting out work at sweating rates. He moved that the Council's amendment be not insisted on.

Question passed, the amendment not insisted on.

No. 28—Clause 41, strike out the whole:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This clause provided that certain persons who gave out work should be deemed occupiers of factories. He moved that the amendment be not insisted on.

Question passed, the amendment not insisted on.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee prepared and brought up reasons; the reasons were adopted, and a

message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE BILL.
COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT—CLOSING OF ORD STREET.

The Legislative Council having amended the schedule, and the Assembly not agreeing to the amendment, reasons for same were now considered in Committee.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Council's amendment be not insisted on. He regretted having to do so, but did not wish to imperil the rest of the Bill.

THE HON. G. RANDELL: As the closing of this street was manifestly in the interests of Perth, some explanation should be given.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The closing of the street was in the interests of the city; but members of another place were firm in their determination, for the present at all events, that Ord Street should not be closed. Not wishing to imperil the rest of the Bill, and with the object of working towards the closing of the street next session, he now moved that the amendment be not insisted on; but he thought it was a great pity that the street should not be closed, because it was manifestly to the advantage of the city of Perth that the exchange proposed to be made should be made. It was also of advantage to the residents of that part of the city.

HON. W. T. LOTON: It was apparent that the local authority had not been consulted, and it was strange the Government had not approached the City Council. This was laxity on the part of the Government, for he was satisfied that the council would have accepted the change. The situation was unfortunate.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY was not aware that the City Council had been approached in a formal manner, but he was informed by the Premier that he (the Premier) had approached the Mayor of Perth in a private capacity. He gathered from the Premier and from the file handed to him with the Bill that the Mayor did not seem adverse to the closing of the street. It appeared, however, that the City Council approached the member for Perth in the matter and asked him to oppose the closing of the street in another place.

SIR GEORGE SHENTON: As a member of the new Houses of Parliament Committee, he regretted that the closing of the street had to be adandoned. It was proposed to close Ord Street and make Wilson Street, now three-quarters of a chain in width, a chain and a-half wide, which would be of advantage not only to the residents of that portion of the city but also to the new Houses of Parliament. To make Ord Street on the present levels was simply impossible. At the Harvest Terrace end Ord Street was 30 feet above the level of Harvest Terrace. However, as the City Council was opposed to the closing of the street, the scheme of the Houses of Parliament Committee would have to be dropped for the present.

Question passed, the amendment not insisted on.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Legislative Assembly.

Sitting suspended (awaiting messages from the Assembly).

At 8 o'clock, Chair resumed.

ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.
COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

The Council having made one amendment to the Bill, and the Assembly not agreeing to it, the reasons were now considered in Committee.

No. 5—Clause 20, line 2, strike out the words "sea or":

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister) moved that the amendment be not insisted on. Clause 20, as originally drawn, provided that certain roads boards could make and maintain sea or river jetties. We had struck out "sea or" and refused to give the right to construct sea jetties, but the Legislative Assembly, on the other hand, saw no valid reason why the power should be limited to river jetties only. In regard to the amendment, he was entirely in the hands of the Committee.

HON. A. G. JENKINS asked the House to insist on the amendment. The clause was first of all placed in the Bill by the Council, and the amendment to strike out the words was fully debated, the Committee having come to a decision without a division.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: It was not decided on the voices.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The hon. member was not in his place at the time. The only opponent to the amendment was the Colonial Secretary. The matter was decided on the voices.

Question negatived, the amendment insisted on.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Legislative Assembly.

## CONFERENCE ON CONSTITUTION BILLS (3).

Messages (three) received from the Legislative Assembly, desiring a free conference respecting three several Bills, namely the Electoral Bill, the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, and the Redistribution of Seats Bill; also announcing that at such conference the Legislative Assembly would be represented by five managers.

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would enable the House to deal with these three Messages at once.

HON. S. J. HAYNES seconded the motion.

Question passed (a statutory majority present), and Standing Orders suspended accordingly.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I move "That a free conference be agreed to, as requested by the Legislative Assembly in its messages 64, 65, and 66."

HON. W. T. LOTON (East): The messages request a free conference on each Bill. I should like to know before this question comes to a settlement whether the whole of each Bill is to be opened up, or whether the conference is to be only on matters of disagreement.

THE PRESIDENT: My opinion is that the only questions to be dealt with by a free conference would be the matters in dispute. Messages have passed between the two Houses disagreeing with certain clauses in the Bills.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): Under the Standing Orders, whatever matters are concurrently agreed to by both Houses cannot be touched.

THE PRESIDENT: Simply the matters in disagreement between the two Houses.

Question put and passed.

HON. M. L. MOSS moved "That the place and time of holding the conference be the Committee Room of the Legislative Council, at the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow."

Question passed.

HON. M. L. MOSS moved "That the Hon. J. D. Connolly, Hon. S. J. Haynes, Hon. Geo. Randell, Hon. Zeb. Lane, and Hon. Dr. Hackett be the managers to represent the Council at the conference requested by the Legislative Assembly."

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN moved that a ballot be taken.

THE PRESIDENT: If one member requests it, a ballot must be taken. Five names only must be put on the paper.

Ballot taken (one voting paper was missed and not traced), the following members being appointed managers for the Council: Hon. J. D. Connolly, Hon. J. W. Hackett, Hon. S. J. Haynes, Hon. Z. Lane, Hon. G. Randell.

Message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

THE PRESIDENT left the Chair at 8·40 o'clock.

At 9·13, Chair resumed.

Message in reply received from the Legislative Assembly, agreeing to the time and place suggested by the Council for holding the conference.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9·15 o'clock, until 11 a.m. the next day.