

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) said it appeared from all that had fallen from hon. members that evening, that the general feeling was in favour of Mr. Sholl's services being recognised in some more substantial manner than the Government had been able to do under the Superannuation Act. The most feasible plan for doing so, it appeared to him, would be—although he was not in any way going to commit the Government to it—to capitalise his pension, and supplement the amount with a special vote. The Government had gone as far as they could, within the limits of the Superannuation Act. In order to enable him to consult the wishes of His Excellency the Governor on the subject, he would move, That Progress be reported, and leave given to sit again on Monday.

Agreed to.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at half-past eight o'clock, p.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Thursday, 18th August, 1881.

Colonial Accounts for Imperial Audit—Losses sustained by guano contracts with Messrs. Beaver & Co.—Consideration of Message No. 16 (Consolidation of Statutes)—Sandalwood Bill: in committee—Excess Bill, 1879: Resolution with reference to—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at noon.

PRAYERS.

COLONIAL ACCOUNTS FOR IMPERIAL AUDIT.

MR. STEERE, in asking the Honorable the Colonial Secretary, "Whether the Report relative to the discontinuance of the forwarding Colonial Accounts for Imperial Audit in 1870 was laid upon

"the Table of this House by the authority of His Excellency the Governor," said he asked the question in consequence of what he considered to be a grossly libellous letter which appeared in the *Inquirer* newspaper, on Wednesday last, signed "Loyalty," insinuating that the report in question (which he had moved for the other day) had been placed on the Table in what he might call a surreptitious manner, and without the authority of His Excellency the Governor. He therefore wished to ask the noble lord whether such was the case?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford): In reply to the hon. member's question, I have to refer him to His Excellency's Minute of the 5th instant, already presented to this Council, and which is in the following words:—*Colonial Treasurer*.—"When I authorised a copy of your Report of 1870 to be prepared for presentation to the Legislative Council, I was not aware that it contained any observations which, if put forward unaccompanied by further explanations from yourself, would be liable to any misconstruction. Had my attention been called to the character and contents of the report, I should, of course, have afforded you an opportunity of having your say in the matter before the paper was laid on the Table, and I will take care that your present remarks are communicated to the Legislative Council without delay.—"W. C. F. R., 5-8-81." The mistake occurred neither from ignorance of officialism nor from a lack of common courtesy. The report in question was originally laid before the old Legislative Council, and had in reality no business to have been away from the Chambers. The Colonial Secretary is in no way responsible for constructions placed upon his sayings by the Press. Were he to be considered so, his whole time would be occupied.

LOSSES SUSTAINED BY GUANO CONTRACTS WITH BEAVER & CO.

MR. STEERE, in accordance with notice, moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report to this House as to the causes which have led to the heavy losses which have been entailed upon the Colony by the

"nonfulfilment by the Government of "certain guano contracts entered into "with Messrs. Beaver & Co.; with power "to call for persons and papers; and "that the Select Committee consist "of Messrs. Crowther, Burt, Randell, "Parker, and the mover." The hon. member said that now the papers connected with this contract had been presented to the House, the public would expect at any rate that some explanation should be forthcoming as to the causes which had led to the heavy losses which the Colony had sustained in connection with this guano business, and it was by the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the matter that the information which the public naturally expected could best be elicited.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) said he did not rise in any way to oppose the motion, but he did hope and trust that no papers would be called for by the Select Committee calculated to prejudice a case which was still *pendente lite*. In all other respects the Government would only be too happy to meet the wishes of hon. members.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. M. Fraser) said he might mention for the information of those hon. members who would constitute the Select Committee that it was he who had collated these papers, and that he had selected all such as, in his opinion, were likely to afford an insight into the general history of the transactions in question. At the same time, he was not at all certain but there might be other papers which it would be necessary to bring forward in order to furnish the connecting links in the chain of evidence, and he should be happy, in his official capacity, should there be any such missing links, to assist the Committee in forming a complete chain. There was no intention, he was quite sure, on the part of the Government to keep back anything connected with the affair.

MR. STEERE believed there were some important papers relating to the matter, which were not among those presented to the House.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. M. Fraser): Very likely there are.

The motion for a Select Committee was then agreed to.

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES (MESSAGE No. 16).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow), in moving that the House should resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the Message (No. 16) received from His Excellency the Governor, on the 16th August, in which His Excellency expressed his opinion that steps should be taken for revising and consolidating the Colonial Statutes, said he did not think it would require any words on his part to induce the House to agree to the resolution which he was about to submit, in reply to His Excellency's Message. On all sides it had been acknowledged—certainly since he had been in the Colony, and, no doubt, for many years previously—that the state of our statute book is most deplorable; he did not think any language would be too strong in describing it. He would defy any lawyer even—much less gentlemen who were not lawyers—and laws ought not to be made for the sake of lawyers only—he would defy any lawyer, Philadelphian or otherwise, by a perusal of our statute book to get a clear view of what the law is in some cases. He would possibly have to look over half a dozen different Ordinances, some dating back to the foundation of the Colony, before he could arrive at anything like a clear understanding of the law; and it certainly was high time that this state of things should be remedied. He was sure the House had only to hear the words of His Excellency's Message to give the proposal their cordial support.

Motion for going into Committee, agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) moved the following resolution in reply to His Excellency's Message on the subject:—"In reply to Your Excellency's Message No. 16, this Council is of opinion that it is desirable "that steps should be taken for revising "and consolidating the Statutes, and is "prepared to defray the necessary expenses in connection with the same; "and this Council humbly requests that "His Excellency may be pleased to place "a sum upon the Estimates sufficient for "this purpose."

MR. SHENTON asked the Attorney General if he had any idea what would be the probable cost of the work?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) said it was impossible for him to say. It appeared to him the expense would depend on two things: in the first place, the cost of printing, and, secondly, whether the members of the revision Committee would give their services gratuitously. Of course there must necessarily be some clerical assistance, and the clerk undoubtedly would have to be paid.

MR. SHENTON thought it would be well to ascertain what the probable expense would be, before the House committed itself to an expenditure of the extent of which it had no idea.

MR. BROWN said there could be no division of opinion as to the desirability of taking some steps for revising and consolidating our statutes. At present they were so numerous, and so voluminous, that not only did the magistrates of the Colony—who were expected to give judgments in accordance with law—find the greatest difficulty in obtaining copies of the local statutes, but lawyers also experienced the same difficulty, and very few persons indeed had a complete copy of them. It had surprised him that the Government had not taken the step which it was now proposed to take, long ago, for it was a matter of crying necessity, and he hoped they would have all the statutes consolidated by next Session. As to the expense, he thought the simplest plan would be to adopt the resolution submitted by the Attorney General, and leave the question of expense to the Government. He was satisfied they would not throw away the people's money, and that the whole subject would be well and properly dealt with. He was satisfied, for his own part, that they would not be getting in their own friends on this Committee, and paying them out of the pockets of the people, and that if they could obtain the services of the revisers gratuitously they would do so. But probably the work would be of such a nature that they could not possibly expect to get it done for nothing. At any rate, for his own part, he was quite prepared to agree to the resolution as it stood, without limiting the Government to any specific sum. That course would

perfectly suit him, but it had been stated often in that House, and out of it, that such a course would be illegal—that the proper thing for the Government to do was to ask for a specific amount for a specific purpose, and to place that sum on the Estimates, and embody it in the Appropriation Act. Under these circumstances—such being the views entertained by some hon. members—he failed to see why, in order to meet these objections, the Government should not, before the Estimates were done with, endeavour to arrive at some conclusion as to what they consider this work may cost, and place that amount on the Estimates for next year.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) said it would be the duty of the Government, before the Estimates were disposed of, to come forward and state what they conceived the work would cost during the ensuing year. A sum of £200 was voted last year for printing the statutes, which sum had not been expended; and probably an additional £300 would answer the purpose. If the members of the revising Commission belonged to that House, of course they could not receive any fee or reward for their services; but if they would have to employ lawyers outside it was not likely those gentlemen would give their services gratuitously.

MR. STONE asked the Attorney General whether it was proposed simply to consolidate the statutes, or also to amend them. If the intention was merely to consolidate, he thought it would be desirable to introduce a Bill to appoint a Commission for that purpose, so that the consolidated statutes should be received in the Courts as evidence of legal enactments. That would save the time of the House, in going through Acts which had simply been consolidated, and not amended. He believed that course was adopted in England, and also in New Zealand; but in the latter place they allowed the Commission to make some amendments—a course which was very much objected to by the members of the Legislature, by whom it was regarded as an usurpation of the functions of Parliament. If the Acts required amending, it was for the Legislature to do so, but if the object was merely to consolidate existing statutes, a Commission might

be empowered to do all that was required.

MR. STEERE thought it would be very advisable to adopt the course suggested by the hon. member, Mr. Stone. He wished to correct a statement which had fallen from the noble lord opposite—that no member of the House, having a seat on the Commission, could receive any payment for their services. That was not correct. What the Constitution Act provided was that no member of the Legislature shall hold any office of emolument under the Crown—excepting of course the official members. The Act did not preclude any member from taking a fee for services rendered by him in connection with the House. He was sure everybody would wish that some of the legal gentlemen who had seats in the House should be appointed on this Commission, and it would not be expected that they would give their services without some remuneration. But he did not think the whole expenditure would be more than £500 at the outside, and he would suggest that that amount be placed on the Estimates for this purpose. He could not consistently support the resolution unless this were done. He was not in the same position as the hon. member for Geraldton, who was of opinion that the Government had always dealt economically in the administration of the public funds. He thought, on the contrary, they had been extremely lavish in many instances. At all events, he thought it was the duty of the House to put an end to all expenditure by resolutions alone without making provision for the same on the Estimates—a course which had been condemned on all sides, and by His Excellency himself. Should it be found that this sum is not sufficient to complete the work, the House would be in Session again about the middle of next year, when it would be competent for the Government to bring forward a supplementary estimate to carry out this much-needed work to completion.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) said the suggestion made by his hon. friend Mr. Stone was a good one, from one point of view, but he did not know whether it was so from all points. He thought many of the statutes would require amending as well as consolidating, and it would be impossible to

legalise the amendments without the sanction of the House in Committee. For that reason he did not think that a simple Act enabling the Commission to consolidate would be sufficient for the purpose: that would be simplifying the law, not amending it. But he thought it would be admitted that something more than consolidation and simplification, desirable as that was, was required. Some of these statutes were obsolete—that was to say, their wording was obsolete. The essence of the statute might remain, but the phraseology in many instances was verbose, obsolete, and obscure in the extreme, and they would incur great danger in altering even the wording of a statute. As to the expense, he perfectly agreed with the hon. member for the Swan that £500 would cover all the costs incidental to the work, even if the House should consider it expedient to give some reasonable honorarium to those legal members who might choose to give their services on the Commission. If £500 did not suffice, he was sure that a very small supplementary vote would meet the difference.

MR. STEERE asked the Attorney General, whether, in the event of the Commission amending any of the statutes, it would not be necessary to bring every amended statute before the Legislature, before it had the force of law?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow): Certainly. Where no alteration had been made, the marginal notes of the clause might be read; but when a clause had been amended, it would be necessary to read it *in extenso*.

The resolution was then agreed to.

SANDALWOOD BILL, 1881.

The House went into Committee for the consideration of the Bill to prevent the destruction and export of immature sandalwood.

Clause 1.—Short title:

Agreed to.

Clause 2.—“No person shall cut on the Waste Lands of the Crown, within the limits hereafter defined, sandalwood whose circumference shall be less, after being cleaned, than 18 inches round the outer rings of annual growth at the butt, or at a distance of six inches from the starting of the first root of the trunk

"of a sandalwood tree: And it shall be obligatory on all persons holding licenses to cut such sandalwood, to grub up and remove all such trees by the roots, and all licensed persons neglecting so to do shall be liable to a penalty of twenty shillings for each tree which is otherwise cut, instead of being grubbed up and removed as hereinbefore directed."

MR. MARMION said as this clause embodied the leading principle of the Bill, he thought this would be an opportune time for introducing the amendments which he proposed to make, to carry out what he considered to be the most desirable means of attaining the object in view, namely, to fix certain boundaries within which no sandalwood shall be cut for a fixed term of years, rather than to restrict the size of the wood exported, as proposed in this clause. (The hon. member then read the various amendments which he intended to introduce for the purpose of carrying out his proposals, and they were ordered to be printed, before the House entered upon their consideration.) In order to show that he was not singular in his opinion as to the most desirable mode of accomplishing the object which the Bill mainly aimed at, namely, the preservation of immature wood, he would read for the information of the Committee an extract from a letter addressed to an hon. member of that House by a gentleman who had long been directly connected with the sandalwood trade in the Eastern Districts, and which appeared to him to be well worthy of attention. This was what the writer said: "I suppose I am a day behind the fair in attempting to come forward with any remarks upon the Sandalwood Bill. I am however surprised to find the Council again reverting to the old unworkable idea of the six-inch diameter. The Act itself will be found to be more destructive to the growth of the green tree than the present promiscuous slaughter of all sizes. If the cutter or grubber roots up a tree, and it proves not to be six inches in width, what then? He will curse and swear, and the log of wood will be fuel for the bush fires. In order to save and avoid lost labor, the men will bark a tree at the bottom to ascertain whether it will go the six inches, and, if not, pass

on to another; and thus will go on a destruction tenfold worse than the present system. Nothing would die sooner than a sandalwood tree stripped of its bark; and what do such men as the class who go into the bush to cut sandalwood care about wanton destruction? They would rather destroy a dozen trees than lose their labor over one tree by risking the necessary size. Hence it will be found that the proposed Act will defeat itself." "I quite agree," the writer adds, "with the grubbing—it is a wise economy of the wood." The amendments which he (Mr. Marmion) proposed were based, he might say, upon the very same view of the matter as was embodied in this communication, and it was a view which, he believed, would, upon mature consideration, commend itself to the favorable consideration of the majority of the Committee.

MR. BROWN said that, so far as he could understand the proposed amendments by merely hearing them read, they were much more in accord with his own views on the subject, than was the Bill as it now stood; but he would reserve his comments upon them until he saw them in print.

MR. STEERE said, although he was not going to oppose the motion to report Progress, he thought the course adopted was not only a very inconvenient one but a very unusual one. A Select Committee had been appointed by the House to consider and report upon this subject, that Committee had brought up its report, and the House had adopted it. The present Bill merely embodied in legal form the recommendations of the Select Committee, and the House, having agreed to the second reading of the Bill, had affirmed its principle, which was this—that the prevention of the destruction and export of immature sandalwood would be best secured by restricting the size of the wood exported. But now an entirely new principle of dealing with the question was proposed to be introduced. The hon. member's proper course would have been to oppose the second reading of the Bill, and to move, as an amendment, that it be read a second time that day six months. Such a course as that now adopted was unprecedented in any legislative assembly, and would, if generally followed, lead to endless con-

fusion and loss of time. If the principle of a Bill was thus liable to be assailed and altered at every stage, there would be an end to legislation, upon any definite principle.

MR. BROWN quite agreed that the principle of a Bill ought to be affirmed or rejected on the motion for its second reading, but he contended that the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Fremantle in no way affected the principle of the present Bill. The avowed object of the measure was to prevent the destruction of immature sandalwood, and this object was fully recognised in the amendments which had been submitted. It was simply another means of attaining the same end, and the proposed alterations merely affected the details of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) said undoubtedly the amendments proposed to be introduced by the hon. member for Fremantle went very near trenching upon the principle of the Bill. Two distinct and widely different principles had been put forward to deal with the object in view; one was to restrict the areas within which sandalwood shall be cut, and the other to limit the size of exportable wood. The latter principle was dealt with in the present Bill, and the former principle entirely ignored; whereas in the amendments of the hon. member for Fremantle the reverse was the case. For his own part he might say that he sympathised with the views of the hon. member for Fremantle, rather than with those of the Select Committee.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. M. Fraser) said the question had been very carefully considered by the Select Committee, who had given every consideration to both proposals. For his own part he felt inclined to say—

“How happy I could be with either,
Were the other dear charmer away;”

but as they were called upon to choose between the two proposals, he felt bound to give his adherence to the principle embodied in the Bill. He was afraid that the amendments proposed to be introduced by the hon. member for Fremantle would maim the usefulness of the Bill, if not jeopardise it altogether.

MR. BROWN thought the question raised by the hon. member for the Swan,

as to altering the principle of a Bill after its second reading was one upon which it would be desirable to have the ruling of the Chair. Was it competent for the Committee to proceed with the proposed amendments, the House having already affirmed the principle of the Bill?

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES: The matter, I think, is an extremely simple one. The principle of the Bill, I hold, is to prevent the destruction and exportation of immature sandalwood. The Bill itself proposes to attain this object, to carry out this principle, in one way, and the amendments of the hon. member for Fremantle in another. I don't know but that it would have been more convenient, as a matter of convenience, to have moved, as an amendment upon the motion for the second reading, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, and to introduce a new Bill embodying these amendments; but it is perfectly competent for the hon. member to adopt the course which he intends to adopt. Of course he cannot move his clauses as amendments upon the clauses in the Bill, as they would not be relevant, but he can move to strike out the clauses as they now stand in order to insert his own in lieu of them.

MR. RANDELL said he was afraid the Bill would work a great deal of hardship in many cases. He looked upon it with a considerable degree of suspicion, as a speculative measure, and one which might have the effect of ruining an important industry altogether; and, if it ever came into force in its present shape, he hoped it would be provided that it should only remain in operation for a certain number of years. The proposal as to grubbing the trees, instead of cutting them, and rendering it penal to grub any wood for exportation which was not of the required dimensions, would be very hard indeed upon the owners of private land. These people might have occasion to grub up a piece of land for agricultural or other purposes, and, although sandalwood might abound on it, unless the wood so grubbed was 18 inches in circumference, the owner of the land would not be allowed to dispose of it. He thought the object in view might be attained without any

special legislation of this kind—simply by a combination amongst the exporters of the wood.

MR. MARMION said the hon. member's objections applied to the Bill in its present form, and not to the amendments which he proposed to introduce into it.

MR. CROWTHER thought they were providing too elaborate machinery altogether to deal with a very simple matter. The cure for the evil complained of was in the hands of the Government and of the exporters. Let the Government define certain areas within which no wood shall be cut, and if any immature wood is brought to market from areas which are not restricted, let the merchants decline to buy it. That would very soon put an end to the destruction of young wood now complained of.

MR. SHENTON said the great objection to limiting the areas within which wood shall be cut was the heavy expense of inspection, entailed by the necessity of seeing that people did not cut wood within the proscribed areas. He thought the plan suggested by the Select Committee was the simplest, cheapest, and most effectual.

MR. MARMION then moved, That Progress be reported, and leave given to sit again on Wednesday.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

EXCESS BILL, 1879.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) moved, That the House should now resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the consideration of the Bill to confirm the over-expenditure during the year 1879.

MR. STEERE—following up the suggestion made in the course of the debate on the second reading of the Bill—moved, as an amendment, the adoption of the following resolution, as recommended by the Select Committee to whom the Bill was referred last year: “The Council, “whilst recognising the futility of withholding its assent from the Bill intitled ‘An Act to confirm the expenditure for the services of the year 1879, “beyond the grant for that year,’ desires “to enter its protest against the expenditure of such large sums of money “without the sanction of the Legislature “being first obtained; and to prevent

“such large Excess Bills in the future, “it is of opinion that the provisions of “the Appropriation Bill should be strictly “observed; also that a copy of the Select “Committee's report be presented to His “Excellency the Governor by the Speaker, “and that His Excellency be requested “to forward the same for the information “of the Secretary of State.”

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) said he would not offer any opposition to the course proposed by the hon. member.

MR. BROWN regretted to find that the noble lord did not intend, on the part of the Government, to offer any opposition to the resolution submitted by the hon. member for the Swan. He (Mr. Brown) objected to it on this ground: the Council, as a matter of fact, had never considered the report of the Select Committee referred to. Its consideration was deferred upon the ground that, as the Session was on the point of closing, there was no time for the House to consider the report, and to give it that careful deliberation which such an important document was entitled to. Even last year, if its adoption had been pressed, he would have opposed it, because at that stage of the Session there was in reality no difference of opinion between the House and the Government on the subject of unauthorised expenditure. After the declaration made by the Governor in his Opening Speech last year, to the effect that the Government should adhere strictly to the Appropriation Act, and His Excellency's condemnation of the faulty system of appropriating moneys by resolutions, for which no provision had been made on the Estimates—after this declaration of the views held on the subject of over-expenditure by the Head of the Executive, he thought, even last year, it would have been better if the House had not returned to the charge, as it did, at the very close of the Session, when it was evident that the Government and the Council were in accord on the subject. Still more objectionable did he think the introduction of this resolution at present, when the views of the Government on the question of over-expenditure were quite in harmony with the views of the Legislature. It was tantamount to saying that the House did not believe His Excellency's declarations.

As hon. members were aware, the memorial adopted by the Council on the subject last year had been duly forwarded to the Colonial Office, and instructions had been received from the Secretary of State requesting the Government to do all that was considered desirable for the purpose of extending the control of the Legislature over the public finances. This despatch, he believed, had given general satisfaction to hon. members, and the Government, in pursuance of it, had already presented a Bill to the House to carry out the object in view. What necessity, therefore, was there for placing this protest on record? He intended to oppose it—even if he stood alone.

MR. BURT: Was not the hon. member himself a member of the Select Committee who prepared this report?

MR. BROWN: Yes, but I never approved of it.

MR. STEERE: The hon. member never dissented from it.

MR. BROWN: I had no time to enter my protest in writing.

A division being called for, the resolution was agreed to, the numbers being—

Ayes	12
Noes	4
Majority for	8

AYES.
 Lord Gifford
 The Hon. A. C. Onslow
 The Hon. M. Fraser
 Mr. Burt
 Sir T. C. Campbell
 Mr. Higham
 Mr. S. S. Parker
 Mr. Randall
 Mr. Shenton
 Mr. Stone
 Mr. Venn
 Mr. Steere (Teller.)

NOES.
 Mr. Burges
 Mr. Hamersley
 Mr. Marmion
 Mr. Brown (Teller.)

Resolution reported.

The House adjourned at a quarter past three o'clock, p.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Monday, 22nd August, 1881.

Brands Bill, 1881: in committee—Administration of Estates Bill, 1881: further considered in committee—Appropriation Bill (Supplementary), 1881: third reading—Municipal Institutions Act, Amendment Bill: motion for second reading—Excess Bill, 1879: in committee—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at seven o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

THE BRANDS BILL, 1881.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow), before moving the House into Committee to consider the Brands Bill, said it would be observed from the report of the Select Committee to which the Bill had been referred, that several alterations had been made, and some new clauses added, to the original Bill. The alterations, however, were principally of a verbal character, and the new clauses which had been introduced dealt with the subject of earmarking, the Committee recommending that earmarks should be registered as well as brands. This, he might say, was a somewhat novel provision, but the Select Committee were strongly of opinion that the circumstances of the Colony rendered it imperative that the owners of cattle and sheep should be allowed to register their earmarks as a means of affording further protection against dishonest persons. The Committee had considered the question with the greatest possible care, inasmuch as it imported into the Bill a principle which he believed he was right in saying did not exist in any of the other colonies; but, regard being had to the peculiar circumstances of this Colony, the Committee strongly advised the adoption of the principle here, and consequently the Bill as amended provided for the registration of earmarks. This, in reality, was the one main point of difference between the present Bill and the Bill as originally printed. Another less important alteration to which he might be allowed to refer was this: under the law as it now stood, every owner of a cow or a horse is obliged to have a registered brand; if he has not, he submits himself to certain pains and penalties—though, as a matter of fact, he believed the law in this respect had rarely been acted upon, and many a man was in possession of a horse, or a cow, without having ever registered a brand in respect of such horse or cow. Under this Bill, as amended, if a person bought a horse or a cow that was not marked with a registered brand, it would be his duty to register himself as the owner of a brand in respect of such animal, and to brand it accordingly. But if the horse or cow was already marked with a registered brand, the purchaser need not trouble himself to have a brand of his own registered.