

who at present leads the country. I say this although I slate him now and then. It is not a good thing to let the Premier believe that one will follow him blindly. I urge him, in conclusion, as emphatically as I can, to keep, preserve, conserve, and maintain whatever State rights Western Australia has—I am sorry to have to say it—as against the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia.

On motion by Mr. BUTCHER, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER: In moving that the House do now adjourn, I express the hope that the debate will conclude tomorrow. If between the adjournment and our meeting again hon. members will look through their speeches and condense them, we can finish the debate tomorrow evening. The country will not suffer by reason of the suggested condensation of speeches.

The House adjourned accordingly at 10:55 o'clock until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 29th July, 1903.

	PAGE
Address-in-Reply, Presentation	222
Leave of Absence (Moss)	223
Bills: Bread Bill, second reading concluded	222
Frison's Bill, second reading concluded	223
Noxious Weeds, second reading	225

THE ACTING PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

On motion by the **COLONIAL SECRETARY**, the Acting President and hon. members proceeded to Government House to meet members of the Legislative Assembly in a joint sitting of both Houses, for the purpose of electing a Senator to the

vacancy created by the resignation of Mr. Norman K. Ewing.

At 5:15 o'clock, business resumed.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT announced the result of the joint sitting of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. [See report of joint sitting.]

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY—PRESENTATION.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT announced that he had received the following communication from His Excellency the Governor:—

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,—

I thank you for your Address in reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament, and for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King.

FRED. G. D. BEDFORD,
Governor.

MOTION—LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the **COLONIAL SECRETARY**, leave of absence for one month granted to the Hon. M. L. Moss, on the ground of urgent private business.

BREAD BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from previous sitting.
HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East): My only object in addressing the House is to say that having read the Bill I can see very little to object to in it, with the exception of one or two slight amendments which can be effected in Committee. I am fortified in my opinion by gentlemen who represent the bread industry. Some of the chief master bakers in Perth take exception to two clauses in the Bill. Clause 14 states:

No person shall obstruct or hinder any search authorised by this Act, or the seizure on any search of anything authorised to be seized.

The master bakers think that the word "wilful" should be inserted, as this breach of the law might be committed unknowingly. The other matter is contained in Clause 16, which says that no person employed in the trade or calling of a baker shall make or bake any bread on Sunday before the hour of 7 o'clock p.m. If that clause is carried, it will be absolutely impossible for the master

bakers to bake their bread for Monday. The men have a holiday from Friday night; they practically have the whole of Saturday to themselves, for they do not go to work again until Sunday night. The master bakers desire that work shall start at 5 o'clock on Sunday night instead of 7, which will give them ample time to prepare the bread for Monday. If the men cannot start work until 7 o'clock at night, the bakers who have large businesses will not be able to bake their bread for Monday's delivery. Every baker wishes to supply bread as fresh as he can on Monday morning, and he wishes to give the best bread possible to his customers. There will be no unnecessary infringement of the Sabbath if the men go to work at 5 o'clock, because the bakers will delay the baking as late as they possibly can. It is stated that it will be absolutely impossible for the master bakers to carry on their business if the men cannot go to work before 7 o'clock. Last session an amendment was carried in the Bread Bill that 5 o'clock should be inserted in lieu of 7 o'clock; and when in Committee I shall move that 5 o'clock be inserted so as to give the master bakers an opportunity of conducting their business in a proper manner. If 5 o'clock is not inserted it means that it will be absolutely impossible for the master bakers to comply with the requirements of their trade.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I think it is necessary to have the words "justices of the peace" struck out. Why should justices be called on to enter the premises of any person who sells or exposes for sale, or who bakes bread or grinds flour, to see that the provisions of the Bill are observed. Who ever heard of a justice of the peace taking samples of bread or dough; or who expects a justice of the peace to take a sample of meal or flour? It is to a certain extent asking justices of the peace to do work which is altogether out of keeping with their position—practically making police constables of them. I hope hon. members will insist on the words being struck out, so that justices will be relieved of these duties which it is endeavoured to impose on them. In Committee I shall move to have the words excised.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: Whom do you prefer, the police?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I draw attention to the matter now so as to give members time to consider the question.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I agree with Mr. Piesse that it is an awkward position to put any justice of the peace in. It is more the work of police constables. Provision is made in the Bill for an inspector, and I think it should be his duty to attend to this matter. I concur with the amendment suggested by Mr. Jenkins. What difference can there be in making the hour at which to start work on Sunday evening five instead of seven? I favour any amendment of that sort when it is desired in the interests of the bakers.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

PRISONS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from previous sitting.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM (North): I have little to say in connection with this Bill. I have chiefly to congratulate the Government in bringing forward what seems to be a very useful Bill, and for the consolidation of the very numerous measures on this subject. I also congratulate the Government on the good clauses which have been inserted in this Bill. I was glad to hear the Colonial Secretary say it is not the intention of the Government to make the prisons too attractive. We know in these very philanthropic days, such places as lunatic asylums and prisons are made as attractive and comfortable as possible. We all agree that nothing should be done to injure any man; still it is only fair, as regards prisons, that they should not be too attractive, but looked on more as places of punishment than places of resort. Every person who goes into a prison or an asylum causes a tax to be levied on those outside, and there are many people outside in poor circumstances who have not committed any crime or done anything wrong, but who are hard up and struggling for existence and cannot afford to be taxed heavily. The Bill is excellent in theory, and it only remains for the administration to be good. Part of that administration should be to make the prisons places that people will not resort to for pleasure. There is

another point that the administration should not lose sight of. All those convicted and put into gaols should do something to earn their existence. It would be at least a comfortable feeling that a man in prison is paying for himself being kept there, and also that he is relieving the taxpayer. Therefore forms of remunerative employment should be introduced. I need not say anything farther in regard to the measure. If it is carried out in a practical manner and the administration is good, I feel it will prove an excellent acquisition to the statute-book. It will be of great advantage to all those who have anything to do with prisons.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): I am in accord with the sentiments expressed by Sir Edward Wittenoom, and I am very pleased to see that the Bill does not contemplate making prisons too attractive, as the hon. member calls it, to a certain class of our population. At certain seasons of the year there are numbers of people who live in a peculiar way on the hard earnings of the rest of the community and manage to commit a crime to get into gaol during the winter months, so as to be comfortably housed and fed and have a comfortable place in which to sleep, rather than sleep in some outhouse. I am glad the Government have got away from the idea which was prevalent in certain quarters recently in reference to coddling prisoners—I think I may use that term. Passing light sentences has proved to be a false system, and has not accomplished the object that the persons recommending this kind of treatment had in view. We understand that the object of imprisonment is to reform. There is very little hope of reforming a man who has been convicted 20 or 30 times. When he gets an opportunity he will return to his old practices. Every opportunity should be given to reform young prisoners who have been convicted for the first time. Every attempt should be made to isolate them from the older and practised prisoners, so that the first offender shall not be instructed in crime. That has been provided for in the Bill. I am also pleased to see that there is some little reward for honest labour on the part of prisoners. I think it is only right that when a person is discharged from prison he should have

some little money with him. If he choose to make bad use of that money, we cannot help that; but it is not right to turn a man away from the gaol with no one to look after him and without a penny in his pocket, and perhaps he is a considerable distance from the place where he previously lived and to which he desires to return. In the old convict days it was a well known fact that there were “shepherds” outside the prison who knew when certain men were to be discharged. These “shepherds” knew that the discharged prisoner would have a certain amount of money with him. There was a certain freemasonry amongst prisoners. The “shepherds” would meet the man and take him away and shepherd him, and help him to spend all the money he had. This may occur again, although I must say from the experience I have had from occupying the position the present Minister does, it is very probable, although there is a very different class of prisoners now from those who were imprisoned under the old convict system. Prisoners are far more clever in the practice of their trade now than the old men were.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: All the latest scientific methods.

HON. G. RANDELL: I am sorry to say they are mostly trained Australians. Mr. Piesse will bear me out when I say that amongst those who were sent out for long or short sentences, especially the earlier prisoners who were sent out, there were splendid men as far as physical strength was concerned, and willingness to use that strength for their employer. Indeed I do not know that a better class of working men than some of those old prisoners, taking them as a class, has ever come into this country. However, as far as I am able to judge from one reading, I think the Bill proceeds on right lines; and I hope funds may be available to carry out the objects which it has in view. And I am particularly pleased to see, although the circumstances of the State are now different from what they were 40 years ago, that some attempt will be made to employ prisoners in out-stations. That system largely prevailed here in the early days; and many of the roads which the settlers have used and enjoyed were the work of prison parties sent out under the warders to different

parts of the country. Had we had Governor Hampton here six years before he came, and kept him six years longer, I think we should have had much more to show for the convict labour introduced to this colony than we can show now. I am pleased to note the repeal of the various Acts dealing with prisons, and to find they are to be all embodied in one statute. That will be much more useful; for I think this measure in several respects an improvement on the old laws. While not brutal or unnecessarily severe, I think its provisions are sufficiently stringent, and that under the careful administration the Minister intends to secure they will accomplish the purposes for which the Bill has been introduced. I hope we shall in the course of time hear that such is the case. I congratulate the Government on the measure.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I also congratulate the Government on their introducing this Bill, because I think it will effect a very desirable object—that of utilising prison labour. For many years past I have thought it a pity that the labour of so many men could not be utilised in a manner beneficial to the men themselves and to the country. Certainly it would be far more satisfactory to the men to know they were doing something of permanent benefit to the State. I have often been informed by those acquainted with prison life that there is nothing so painful to a prisoner as to be put on the treadmill, the reason being that he can never see any object gained by his labour; it is labour for nothing, and has no result. On that account it is felt to be more laborious and more torturing than any other task which can be set him. But when the men are working at some useful occupation in the open air, they feel that there is something to show for their labour; and this feeling, and the feeling that they are receiving some compensation for their work, it is desirable to encourage. I do not know whether well-behaved prisoners are allowed tobacco; but I think they should have a little, because to all smokers it is a source of great comfort. I should say only those who are well-conducted and safe, and not serving long sentences, should be taken out of prison to do work. I congratulate the Government, and am glad to see the Bill brought in.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I am only voicing the sentiments of other members when I specially congratulate the Colonial Secretary on the able manner in which he explained the provisions of this Bill. The fact of our having so little to discuss is due to the clear explanation he gave us in his second-reading speech. I should like to confirm Mr. Randell's observations regarding the early days of the State. It was very good of him to refer to those old prisoners who came here so many years ago. Among them were some really good men. Looking back on it, that period seems like yesterday to me. In my mind's eye I can see those prison parties stationed throughout the country, consisting of decently dressed men, working hard, living in some instances in huts made of blackboys set on end; and when they could not get enough blackboys to make walls in that fashion they used to cut them up into small sections. I vividly remember those camps, and know that the occupants were well-conducted, and did good work for the country. Some of them are still living; and it is pleasing to glance back at those days and to bear tribute to their industry. As an instance, they made a road practically from Albany to Perth; and I am safe in saying that hundreds of miles of that road will stand as a lasting memorial, not only to the physical strength of the labourers, but to the good system on which they worked. This was not altogether due to the warders; because I know that some of the warders were most unpractical men. The prisoners themselves took a considerable interest in the work; and I think it kind indeed of Mr. Randell to refer to them so gracefully. Thanks are due to those men; and although it is not pleasant for everyone to remember that this State was a convict colony, it is gratifying to be able to say that the convicts were of a good class. I only wish to supplement the hon. member's remarks.

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

NOXIOUS WEEDS BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill): In moving the second

reading of this Bill, I am sure I shall be pardoned by hon. members if I rise with with some diffidence to speak on a subject of which I am aware other members know considerably more than I; and I shall have to ask those members to lend their aid in passing the Bill through the second reading stage and through Committee. Regarding the legal aspect of the measure, I may state that it combines the provisions of the South Australian and New Zealand Acts now in force. The statute which is to be repealed by the measure now before us has been current since the year 1900 in the form of a Noxious Weeds Act. I think its title is, "An Act for the extirpation of Noxious Weeds"; and against two of these noxious weeds the legislation of the State has been directed, under the title of the "Spanish Radish and the Scotch Thistle Prevention Act," which I understand became law in 1874, and was repealed by the provisions of the Act of 1900 to which I have just referred. It has been found after an experience of some two or three years in the administration of the present Act by the Department of Agriculture, that its provisions are in some cases inapplicable, and in other cases that the procedure laid down is so cumbersome that, to use the words of one of the officials of that department whom I have consulted, "by the time an inspector has taken the necessary steps to serve all the notices and to go through the various forms connected with the serving of these notices, a noxious weed which was merely sprouting from the ground had flowered, seeded, and faded before he had got the requisite notices through." It is proposed in this Bill that the process shall be considerably simplified. I am well aware that the administration of an Act such as I hope this Bill will become, is attended with considerable difficulty, and must be aided by the exercise of the utmost discretion, and that the Act is one which will undoubtedly call on the Government and the country to provide a sufficient and fairly large sum of money for the enforcement of its provisions. But I think members will agree with me in one thing, that the presence of such an Act on our statute-book, and its discreet administration, are eminently desirable in order that we may cope with these evils in future, should occasion arise, as

I for one hope it will not. The State may be threatened with a visitation by some of the noxious weeds which have rendered unprofitable and practically uninhabitable the fields of other countries. If such a thing should happen, while the invasion is in its infancy it is easy for the Government to set the Bill in operation and check the scourge before it gets beyond the limit of human effort. Provision should be made for the expenditure by the Crown of a very considerable sum of money in carrying out the provisions of the Bill which the Government wish other people to comply with. I feel, as I said before, there will be considerable discussion on the Bill, and I prefer to defer any farther remarks I have to make, except to point out wherein the present Bill differs from the Act now in force, when replying at the end of the debate which I am sure will ensue on the measure. To take the Bill clause by clause, members will see that in Clause 2 the Noxious Weeds Act of 1900 is repealed; that Act I have already alluded to as being cumbersome and ineffective. In Clause 3, which is the interpretation clause, there are one or two amendments. In the first place, members will notice that in the definition of the word "clear" in relation to land it means to cut down and keep down, or to grub or pull up the stems or roots of noxious weeds and to burn and plough under noxious weeds so as in every case to prevent any part of them from flowering. This has been inserted in the Bill at requests which have been received by the Agricultural Department from a large number of settlers in the various districts of the State. It will be noticed the definition of noxious weeds is referred to in Clause 5. "Noxious weeds" are such plants as the Minister, by notice in the *Government Gazette*, may declare to be noxious weeds, either generally or in any particular locality. Hitherto the noxious weeds have been contained, I mean legally contained, in the schedule of the Bill, and it has been stated that noxious weeds might be nominated by local boards and also by the Agricultural Advisory Board. While the Government wish to take advantage of local experience, it is felt that it would not be right for boards to nominate what are noxious weeds and

what are not. There is an important change in the definition of "owner," which means the person for the time being registered in the Land Titles Office or the Register of Deeds as the proprietor or owner of the land, and includes the lessee of any land or the agent for any land. This provision has been inserted in the present Bill to meet certain difficulties which have arisen in the case of absentee owners. There are certain estates within Western Australia in connection with which it is hard to fix the liability in administering a Bill such as this one. A person may say "I cannot carry out the provisions of the Act; I cannot spend money without authority from England or New South Wales, as I am only an agent." It is proposed by the Bill to make this person responsible, and by the course of natural business, and if not by natural business by legal process, the agent is able to get from his employer what is expended in this connection. Clause 4 gives the necessary power for the appointment of inspectors, and also provides that an inspector under the Bill may perform duties other than in connection with this Bill. Clause 5 gives the Minister the power to declare noxious weeds. Clause 6 gives inspectors the necessary power of entry. In Clause 7 there is again an innovation which will have the effect I hope of obviating the cumbersome process that had to be gone through in exercising the provisions of the present Act. Under the old Act an inspector had only to discover noxious weeds on land, then he notified the Minister, and the Minister had to give authority to serve a notice. Then the serving of notices began, and members who have not been in receipt of these notices, I suppose some have not, will scarcely believe that no less than four forms of notices and four separate deliveries had to be gone through before formal notice was given to the man on whose land noxious weeds were growing. The present Bill provides that these formalities shall not be gone through, but it is proposed in Clause 7 that an inspector finding noxious weeds growing on any land shall himself personally give notice to the occupier, and he shall intimate the portion of land on which such noxious weeds are growing. Then the process of law takes its course. The

occupier having received the notification is supposed to clear the land in a satisfactory manner of the weeds growing thereon. The clause also gives power to justices to try the case and to suspend proceedings for any time, not exceeding three months, upon being satisfied that the man accused is using reasonable exertions to clear his land. Clause 9 provides that in default of action by the occupier the inspector shall cause the land to be cleared at the occupier's expense. Clause 10 gives to the Minister power of ascertaining the amount of the expense and recovering the same. Then Clause 11 sets forth the relations which are to exist between the proprietor of the land and the occupier. Clause 12 provides that the owner of a frontage to a road shall clear half the width of the road of noxious weeds.

HON. G. RANDELL: That is where you should put the Government in.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I expected some remarks on that clause, but I did not expect them from the quarter the interjection came from. Clause 13 deals with encumbrances on holdings that have been created by the operation of the Bill, and they are the same that exist in most Acts dealing with property and the transfer of property. Clause 14 is in the same direction and provides that the mortgagee may add to his debt any money which he, as mortgagee, expends on the land over which he holds the mortgage. Clauses 15 and 16 deal with the manner in which notices may be served and proof of service. Clause 17 gives a penalty for obstructing the inspector, and no doubt some members will wish to insert the word "wilful" in that provision. Clause 18 provides for the appropriation of penalties under the Bill, and Clause 19 is purely a legal clause dealing with proof of ownership. Clause 20 deals with the owner and his agent, and Clauses 21, 22, and 23 are the machinery clauses of the Bill. I have nothing more to say on the Bill. I feel that other members will be able to give the House a good deal more information on the subject itself, the concrete aspect of the subject, than I can give. But it appears desirable that such a Bill should be placed on the statute-book, so that should we be the victims of an incursion of noxious weeds we shall have the

requisite machinery to deal promptly and effectively with such an invasion. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East) : This small Bill appears to be a very simple one, but it is of great importance and one that will prevent an immense amount of trouble and loss. There may be a great deal of difficulty in administering the Bill and in defining what are noxious weeds. I know that the Spanish radish in some places is regarded in a favourable light, while in others it is most noxious. How to deal with it, and eradicate it effectively, I do not know. There is a farm in the Newcastle district—it is not mine now, or I should not speak about it—where the Spanish radish has grown for a number of years. I grew hay crops there year after year, but the weeds grew there and the seeds of the Spanish radish I found remained in the ground for many years before they germinated. It is impossible to get the Spanish radish out of this country, for the land is inundated with the weed. With regard to stinkwort, the eradication of this weed may possibly be carried out, because it has not the serious hold on the country that the Spanish radish has. Still this weed is growing along the railway embankments and on Crown lands, and if something is not done to remove it from these lands, it will be impossible to eradicate it from private lands. I hope some reasonable method will be arrived at for eradicating noxious weeds; but I think the Spanish radish has gone too far. It is like the Guildford grass, which you cannot eradicate now. It is spreading all over the country, and in the Newcastle district and at Northam it is increasing. A lot of other noxious weeds are likely to be brought into this country in imported seeds. People should be very careful in purchasing nothing but clean seed. I see many advantages in legislating in this way which will be satisfactory to the whole of the country.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON (North) : There are certain points I should like to refer to in this Bill. In Clause 3, noxious weeds are defined as plants such as the Minister may declare to be noxious weeds. Is the Minister the only person to determine what are noxious weeds? I would like to have an answer on that point. The Minister cannot know what

are noxious weeds, and very often what are noxious weeds in one district are useful feed in another district. Mr. Dempster has referred to the Spanish radish. In the Gingin district it is used as feed for stock in paddocks.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : The Minister has the service of the whole of the Agricultural Department at his disposal.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON : In most cases the Spanish radish is regarded as a noxious weed, but some people think it is not. I want to find out who is to advise the Minister on this subject.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : The department under the care of the Minister.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON : The Bill says that the Minister shall declare what are noxious weeds. I wish also to refer to the second paragraph of Clause 7, which says that in the case of sheep or cattle stations the notice shall indicate as nearly as practicable the portion or portions of the land on which the noxious weeds are growing. I suppose this Bill will apply to the whole State.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : No. The hon. member will see in the definition of "noxious weed," that we may declare that certain weeds shall be "noxious" either generally or in any particular locality.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON : I was about to say that if it is to apply to the northern cattle stations, they will have a big contract on hand; but if it is to apply to certain districts only, it is all right. One clause reads, "In the case of sheep or cattle stations." I shall reserve farther remarks until we go into Committee.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East) : I hope the Colonial Secretary will not go into Committee on this Bill till next week. It is very simple, but its very simplicity frightens me. As I cannot find anything in it to object to, I do not like the look of it. It is like a cat, whose paws feel soft enough so long as her claws are hidden. I hope the Committee stage will not be pushed, but that members will be given a little time for consideration. I think these Bills should be served out in duplicate. We like to leave a copy in our books, and we could take away the duplicates and consider them; at least the country members could when travelling long distances. Any remarks I have to make on the Bill can be made in Com-

mittee. It seems to me to be almost all that could be desired. Anyway, I must admit the need for a Bill dealing with noxious weeds. I am sorry the Government have not seen their way to mention some of the weeds in the Bill, for the sake of defining them. They were defined in the schedule to the old Act. The only dangerous points are those to which Mr. Richardson referred. Much power is placed in the hands of the Minister. However, I suppose the Colonial Secretary will be assisted by an advisory board of practical men, whose advice will doubtless be taken in the administration of the Act.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): There is one point to which I should like to draw the Colonial Secretary's attention, in addition to the fact that the importance or the worthlessness of this Bill will entirely depend not so much on the proclamation, at which Mr. Richardson looks with so much alarm, as on the districts to which the Bill applies—whether it is made general or made partial in its effect. Legislation of this kind can easily be made unnecessarily harassing; and it can only be effective if made to apply to all districts in which the pests flourish. There is one seed-bed for these noxious plants to which I cannot find any reference in the Bill; and that is the towns of the State. Anyone who walks about the streets of Perth during two or three months of the year will find them covered with these noxious weeds, chiefly the stinkwort; and it is absolutely useless punishing the farmer and putting him to expense when the municipalities of the State are allowed to breed these weeds at their own sweet will. I know that some municipalities, a little more far-seeing than others, take steps to eradicate the weeds; but in the larger towns, which are most frequented and which we must surely blame for these pests spreading from the streets into the country, the precautions taken are wholly insignificant. I hope the Minister will see whether anything can be done in the Bill to meet the want. The only clause which can be supposed to apply to this is Clause 12:—

Where land abuts on a road, or is intersected by a road, the boundaries of the land on each side of the road shall, for the purposes of this Act relating to the clearing of noxious weeds,

be deemed to be extended to the centre of the road, and the occupier of the land shall accordingly be deemed to be the occupier of so much of the road as is within such extended boundaries.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: We can add a subclause making municipalities responsible for doing their own cleaning-up.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There is some such provision in the Municipalities Act, but there is no person to see it enforced. We shall have to give the inspector power to call on municipalities to keep their streets clean.

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: As several members have intimated to me an inclination to pause where we are, and before going farther to avail themselves of an opportunity of examining closely and in some cases I believe of laying before their constituents the Bills we have introduced, I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 11th August.

Question passed.

The House accordingly adjourned at 8 minutes past 6 o'clock, until Tuesday, the 11th August.

JOINT SITTING.

Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 29th July, 1903.

Federal Senate Vacancy, an Election	PAGE
				229

In accordance with the Standing Orders passed by both Houses of Parliament and approved by His Excellency the Governor, the members of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assem-