stood, he would not obtain the information which he sought for. The Government would support the resolution because they believed that the information obtained would be most useful, not only to the hon. member, but also to themselves. The question of legality was a point which it was highly desirable should be settled before the present sole right which the Government had in declaring hundreds was the prerogative of Her Majesty. The more prosaic and democratic, he would not have declared a hundred in a district, save to parties rights which they would not fast feel justified in proclaiming other hundred without farther and more defective information. There, therefore be a great benefit arising from the resolutions; but in the first instance he thought the Committee should be directed to the mere question of legality, and afterwards the Committee could he instructed to take evidence and report on other matters referred to.

The Hon. J. BAKER did not want an amendment, that the Committee should take evidence and power to report from time to time. They could thus report first on the question of legality, and then on the other matters contained in the resolution. A Committee acting in this way would, while taking evidence on one point, be able to elicit much information in reference to the other matters. He, therefore, suggested this course. Of course the hon. the Chief Secretary was desirable to say any other member when the Council would be likely to get through the work of the session, and from what he had heard, he, Mr. Baker, imagined it would be done somewhat than he had contemplated.

The Chief Secretary said there was no inconsistency in what he had then said. He believed, as he had said in a previous occasion, that the Council would sit for another month, but that period it far to him would be sufficient for the Committee to do the work laid down in the resolution.

The Hon. J. BAKER did not want an amendment anything like in favour of the hon. member. He merely urged the suggestion respecting the Committee, because he believed it highly essential that the Legislature should take steps to put the question of hundreds on a proper footing.

The Hon. S. DAVENPORT would be happy to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member, and would thereupon move the addition of the words, "with power to take evidence and report from time to time on the different points contained in the resolution."

The motion was carried.

The Committee was then ballotted for, the result being as follows: Messrs. Baxter, Youngs, Bannister, Forster, Ayres, and Davenport (four).

MESSAGE.

The Hon. Captain Hall moved that a message be forwarded to the House of Assembly requesting that the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Mr. Bage), and Mr. Browne, be allowed to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee then sitting, in accordance with the resolution.

LAW OF PROPERTY AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. J. MORRIS moved the third reading of the Law of Property Amendment Bill which was carried.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed, and ordered to be forwarded to the House of Assembly with a message informing the House that the Council had agreed to the Bill with amendments.

AUXILIARY RIFLE CORPS BILL.

The Hon. Major O'HALLORAN moved the third reading of the Auxiliary Rifle Corps Bill, which was carried.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed, and ordered to be forwarded to the House with a message informing the House that the Council had agreed to the Bill with amendments.

DOG ACT.

The Chief Secretary moved the second reading of a Bill initiating an Act to repeal an Act No. 6, of 1845, intitled, "An Act for abating the nuisances and damage caused by property owned or occupied by a great number of dogs which are loose in the province of South Australia, and to make other provisions in lieu thereof." It would appear that the first time the Police Department had been called upon to take steps to abate the nuisances arising from the vast number of dogs which were allowed to run loose throughout the province, and that a somewhat similar measure had been passed in 1852. This Act had, however, become almost a dead letter, in consequence of there being no penalty for using dogs of the same kind, and the owner was, in most cases, merely fined. The Act also made it an offence to keep more than two dogs without a licence, while the penalty was not very severe.

The Hon. J. BAKER seconded the motion.

The Hon. the Chief Secretary said that the resolution of the hon. members embodied two points: first, the prohibitions, and, secondly, the legality of these prohibitions. As a whole, he had no objection to the resolution, but he would suggest to the House that it was asking for more than, during the session, he was likely to obtain. He should suggest that the hon. member who had put the resolution forward should have had somewhat of an aversion to being caught especially when they had any suspicion of the design of the parties who were trying to catch them. When caught, also, another difficulty arose. Dogs did not bear their captivity with the most lamb-like patience (laughter)—and they were frequently so savage under the