

know that we ought to take exception to it. I notice that the expenditure of the money is limited to the equipment of motors and lamps and other appliances in connection with the undertaking. That being so it serves to safeguard the expenditure.

The Premier: It cannot be expended except in connection with the undertaking.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I understand from what the Premier says it is necessitated by the contract entered into by the Government to supply current from the new power house. I see no objection to the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, 1st September.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 8.23 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 26th August, 1914.

	PAGE
Papers presented	892
Question: Police Protection at Wongan	892
Standing Orders Suspension	892
Bills: Geraldton Agricultural and Horticultural Society's Land, all stages	893
Foodstuffs Commission, 3R.	894
Bunbury Motor 'Bus Service, 3R.	894
Osborne Park Tramways Purchase, 3R.	894
Electoral Act Amendment, report stage	894
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	894
Rights in Water and Irrigation, 2R.	910
Kingia Grass Tree Concession Confirmation, 2R.	913
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R.	914

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Annual Report of the Bunbury Harbour Board for 1913. 2, Return of Exemptions granted during the year 1913-14 under the Mining Act, 1904.

QUESTION—POLICE PROTECTION AT WONGAN.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the frequent complaints of travellers and others in regard to the prevalence of drunkenness and disorderly conduct at Wongan? 2, Will he consider the necessity for affording police protection?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, No. A report will be called for. 2, Inquiries are being made with a view to establishing police stations on the Wongan Hills-Mullewa railway, but until this line is taken over by the Railway Department and the requirements of certain centres can be definitely ascertained, it is not considered desirable to proceed with the erection of buildings. Wongan Hills is frequently visited by the Goomalling police.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.33] moved—

That the Standing Orders relating to public Bills and the consideration of

Messages from the Legislative Assembly be suspended during the remainder of the session so far as is necessary to enable Bills to pass through all their stages in one sitting, and Messages to be taken into immediate consideration.

He said: The necessity for the motion will be recognised when I say that it is intended to close down some time in next week, it is to be hoped early next week, because the Legislative Assembly will be prepared to conclude their business on Tuesday next.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Do you propose to send down the Esperance Northwards Railway Bill?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. It is not coming down. There will be no agricultural railway Bills submitted this session, no agricultural railway Bills of any kind.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Have they got the Estimates yet?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, the Estimates are not coming down. I beg to move the motion I have just read.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [4.35]: I would like the Minister, for our information and for general information, to tell the House what business he proposes to put through under this motion, and also whether the Government have determined anything with regard to future dates as to when it is proposed to hold the Assembly elections. I would especially like him to say that in no case would His Excellency the Governor be advised to dissolve Parliament except immediately in view of the general elections, for this reason: that it would be unthinkable that a Government and the Administration of the country should be left for any length of time without Parliament at its back.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [4.36]: I did intend, with the permission of the House after this motion was carried, to tell members exactly what legislation it was proposed to submit to the House for their consideration. There will be the Foodstuffs Commission Bill, the Bunbury Motor Bus Service Bill, the Osborne Park

Tramways Purchase Bill, the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, the Bills of Sale Act Amendment Bill, the Rights in Water and Irrigation Bill, the Kingia Grass Tree Concession Confirmation Bill, the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Bill, and the motion of the hon. Mr. Colebatch with regard to the production of papers, and probably there may be some Bills on the way from the Legislative Assembly. With regard to the date of the election, this is a matter which has to be decided, and will be decided very shortly by Cabinet. As soon as I obtain the information I will supply it to hon. members.

Question put and passed.

BILL — GERALDTON AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY'S LAND.

All Stages.

Introduced by the Colonial Secretary and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.38] in moving the second reading said: This is a measure to validate the sale of land by the Geraldton Agricultural Society. Two years ago a deputation waited upon the Minister for Lands and pointed out that the ground previously used for show purposes by the society was too small. They suggested an exchange with the Government as they had valuable Crown lands adjacent to the town. Negotiations on this basis were opened up, and it was finally arranged that the society should be given another site with the right to sell the land comprised in the original block, the proceeds to be devoted to the improvement of the show ground. It was originally proposed that, because the old magazine site was to be used for the purpose of a show ground, out of the proceeds of the sale of the old block the Society should remunerate the Government. It was eventually discovered that a ground for the purpose of a new magazine site could be secured on Crown lands, and consequently the Government did not

insist upon payment in connection with the other land. Subsequently the old show ground was subdivided and sold, but it was found that the purchasers could not obtain the title, for the reason that the Geraldton Agricultural Society did not hold the freehold of the block. They simply held a 999 years' lease. As a result of that the purchasers of the block were unable to obtain the title. The sole object of the Bill is to enable the purchasers to obtain the title in freehold, which they sought for in the first instance.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1. Foodstuffs Commission.
2. Bunbury Motor 'Bus Service.
3. Osborne Park Tramways Purchase.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan) [4.48]: I think it undesirable that this Bill should be pressed in the present circumstances, that the House should be asked to discuss a measure of this character when attention is necessarily directed to far more serious matters. Nor do I think that either the general public or the trading public are taking so keen an interest in this Bill as they usually take in measures of this nature closely affecting them. Further, there is a general understanding that no contentious matters shall be brought forward. I ob-

serve that Clause 6 provides for the registration of transfers or assignments of bills of sale. I consider it is utterly immaterial whether an assignment or a transfer is registered or not. It is immaterial to the general public whether the money secured by the bill of sale is owing to John Brown or Tom Smith. This in particular is an unnecessary provision, and should be struck out. As regards Clause 7, I think Mr. Gawler has already pointed out that the limitation of three months in the event of insolvency is bad, because the holder of a bill of sale, thinking that the instrument was good, might in the ordinary course sell chattels, and the purchaser at the end of three months might find that he had no title and that, therefore, it was necessary to surrender the chattels. That certainly is objectionable; and, seeing how difficult it already is for people to borrow money on the security of a bill of sale, it is obvious that the mere insertion of all these clauses involving additional disabilities will make it practically impossible for needy persons to borrow on the security of a bill of sale. For that reason alone I think that we might, at this juncture, very well drop the measure. Subclause 2 of Clause 7 is also objectionable. I do not know where this provision comes from. It reads as follows:—

If any agreement for the hire, with or without the right of purchase, of chattels becomes void, as herein provided, such chattels shall for the purpose of this section be deemed the property of the hirer.

The hirer may have paid just a nominal deposit on the purchase of the goods, and, later on, through some point arising, say, as regards an informality in the bill of sale, the goods go back and become the property of the hirer.

Member: No; that is not so.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: That is rather hard on the owner, surely. It appears to me that that is the effect of the subclause. Again, Clause 10 proposes to repeal Section 46 of the principal Act, which provides for the limit of £30. I think that, in the general interest, the minimum of £30 should be retained. It is

well known that people who borrow on this class of security, if they borrow a lesser sum than £30, will have very little left for themselves by the time they have paid charges and expenses. Borrowers of small sums are driven to a questionable class of lender, who usually sees that he gets more than his fair share. Therefore, for the protection of the borrower himself, it would be better to maintain the limitation of £30. A man who wants £5 or £10, or say £15, would really be acting more in his own interest if he sold the goods instead of borrowing on them at the price he would have to pay for the accommodation, to people willing to lend. Clause 17, it will be observed, proposes that bills of sale may be granted to persons who supply seed, fertilisers, bags, or twine. At the first glance that looks all right, but what about the storekeeper who is providing the settler with stores or horse feed to enable him to put his crop in? The other merchant under this clause would be given a preference over the storekeeper; and that does not seem fair. I know that in the country districts the storekeeper, generally speaking, has stood nobly by the farmers.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The storekeeper would have to give notice.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Yes; the other man gets a preference over him. I fail to see the equity of that arrangement. The whole Bill is bristling with things of that kind, and for that reason alone I think it is most inadvisable to proceed with the measure, and I trust the leader of the House will see his way to withdraw it. As regards Clause 18, the hon. Mr. Gawler also pointed out that the employee is well provided for. Wages are supposed to be paid weekly, and if they are not so paid the employee need only go to the police court, where he can obtain judgment in 24 hours. Then, if the amount is not paid, there is distress, and the debtor may be imprisoned. Therefore the employee is amply provided for. As I have said, the mere insertion of these disabilities will make it even more difficult than it is at present to raise money on the security of a bill of sale. Turning now to the schedule, we see that the fees for regis-

tration of bills of sale are to be increased. I do not see why they should be increased. It merely goes to pile expenses on the unfortunate borrower. It does not cost any more to register a bill of sale for £30 than to register one for £500. The Government get their revenue in this respect from the stamp duty, and not from the fees. In fact, it is just as easy to register a bill of sale for £3,000 as one for £30. Why borrowers should have to pay increased fees I do not understand. The stamp duty alone is what the Government can legitimately claim as revenue. The foregoing are, briefly, some reasons why I think the Bill should not be pressed at this stage. I hope the leader of the House will see his way to withdraw the measure. If not, then in the interests of the community generally it should be postponed altogether.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [4.56]: If this were not a measure of urgency, I would not submit it to the House at the present time. The matter is, however, urgent, because to some extent this is a validating Bill. If hon. members will refer to Clause 2 they will see the following words:—

Section 5 of the principal Act is amended by omitting the words: "or within three days of the registration," in the definition of "contemporaneous advance". . . .

Under the principal Act "contemporaneous advance" means—

An advance of money by the grantee to or at the request of the grantor or the sale of goods or property upon credit, or the drawing, accepting, indorsing, making, or giving of any bill of exchange, promissory note, or the execution of any guarantee, bond, or other similar undertaking by the grantee to, for, or on behalf of the grantor on the security of any bill of sale, and contemporaneously with the granting, or within three days of the registration thereof.

That is the important point. The interpretation of that is that the security would be protected only if the advance were made on the granting of the bill

of sale and within three days after the registration. Any advance made between those dates would not be protected. I am given to understand that there has been an interpretation of the Bills of Sale Act to that effect, that an advance should not be regarded as a contemporaneous advance unless it was made on the signing of the bill of sale, and then within three days after the bill of sale had been registered.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The Act says "or within three days of the registration thereof."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That means, after registration.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: I know of no interpretation of that sort.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is the interpretation put on it, and I am under the impression that it is the ruling of the Court as well. At any rate, it is the interpretation; and, if it is correct, it means that scores of holders of bills of sale already registered are not adequately protected.

Hon. C. Sommers: Let us pass that clause, and leave the others out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not greatly concerned about a number of clauses in this Bill, but it is essential that this one should pass. It is regarded as of very great importance, because Section 6 of the principal Act provides that every bill of sale shall contain—

The true consideration, and what portion, if any, is for an antecedent debt or contemporaneous advance. If that is not correctly stated, the bill of sale is void.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: By Clause 7, three months' previous notice is required to be given.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then with regard to crops about to be sown or grown. At present there is no machinery enabling a bill of sale to be given over crops about to be sown or grown, and it is very necessary that there should be such machinery. The Government, in the public interest, very often find it necessary to advance to agricultural settlers seed wheat and fertilisers; and if the Government do that, they must have

security. At the present time they cannot take security over a crop to be grown. Similarly, a merchant who may be prepared to advance seed wheat and fertilisers, or even the necessities of life, to farmers cannot at present obtain security.

Hon. W. Patrick: This would include necessities, giving preference to certain lines.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: At present a bill of sale cannot be granted over crops about to be sown or grown. The proposed amendment, however, will enable the agricultural settler to give such a bill of sale. Unless the principal Act is amended so as to enable the Government to take bills of sale over crops about to be sown or grown, the Government will not be able to supply seed wheat and fertilisers in the circumstances I have indicated.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Does the Bill provide that the Government shall give notice of registration?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. Mr. Patrick has stated from time to time in this House that the South Australian Government advance seed wheat and fertilisers and other things to settlers without getting any security. It is true that the South Australian Government do not take a bill of sale, but that State has legislation which makes such advances a first charge on the land and on the crop and so gives practically the security of a bill of sale. Under Clause 17 it is not necessary to give notice of intention where the bill of sale is security for the payment for seed wheat and fertiliser. This applies not only to the Government but to anyone else who supplies the farmer with seed wheat and fertiliser. The hon. Mr. Gawler complained of this.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Why should not they be put on the same footing?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is done now in certain cases.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: It is illegal.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not illegal. It is done in connection with stock and wool. It is distinctly provided that there is no need to give notice of intention in regard to stock and wool, so

that this is no novel principle which the Government propose to introduce. The Government wish to extend this principle in a judicious way and make it apply to seed wheat and fertiliser as well as to stock and wool. Supposing the House insisted upon notice of intention being given in the case of a merchant or the Government taking a bill of sale as protection for supplying a farmer with seed wheat and fertiliser, what would be the result? The farmer would be anxious to get his crop in and the merchant or Government would be prepared to assist him. Notice of intention would be given and any creditor could come along and object.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Why should not he?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If so it would prevent the farmer from getting the seed wheat and fertiliser and placing himself in a better financial position than would otherwise be the case.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You are destroying the whole system of the credit of the farming community.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If this clause is not passed, it will be impossible to assist these people. Any storekeeper to whom the farmer owes £5, £2 or even £1 could come along and block the registration. Why should Parliament have agreed to the exclusion of wool and stock from the operation of Section 18 of the Act? It was debated in this House and it was considered wise to exclude stock and wool from the provision which compels notification of intention to register a bill of sale. I am placing these facts before the House, and it is for the House to decide. Members can rest assured that any advance of public money must be and will be properly protected by the Government. I do not wish to stress the debate on the wages clause. The present is not the time for anything in the nature of an acrimonious debate. Provision is already made by law to secure the rent of a landlord, and under the Companies' Act and the Bankruptcy Act, the salary of any servant is protected to the extent of £50 and the wages of any workman to the extent of £25. I very much wish that the particular clauses

to which I have referred should be passed by this House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 8:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I hope this clause will not be agreed to. It can have no possible object except to place one more obstacle in the way of people desiring to borrow money. It can matter little to the creditors whether the borrower owes money to A or B provided it is disclosed that he does owe money. If money is owed to A, this discloses the fact to the creditors. If A wishes to transfer to B, why should the transfer be registered? It will not place the creditors in a better position, but under this clause, if the transfer is not registered, the document will be rendered void, and if the borrower becomes bankrupt, the lender will have no security. The Minister cannot advance a single reason why the transfer should be registered.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I studied the original draft of the Bill and it provided that the transfer need not be registered. I will leave the matter to the House.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 7—Avoidance of unregistered bills of sale:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of paragraph (b) of Subclause 1, "three months" be struck out, and the words "fourteen days" inserted in lieu.

This will bring the suspense term into line with that in the Bankruptcy Act. I know of no good reason for holding up the business for more than 14 days.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I do not agree with the hon. Mr. Cullen, because the object of the clause is to ensure that the holder of a bill of sale shall not be able to take advantage of it before the person who gives it goes bankrupt or the business is wound up. If the time is limited

to 14 days, the holder of a secret unregistered bill of sale would be in an advantageous position.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: This affects all bills of sale and not merely secret bills of sale.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: It is aimed at secret bills of sale.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: It is like a boomerang; it hits them all.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: The holder of a bill of sale would easily know 14 days before the bankruptcy that there was something wrong, and could take possession of the chattels and remove them, which is the very object sought to be avoided by the clause. In all Bills of Sale Acts in the past, a period of three months has been observed. It may not be out of the way to make it two months, but 14 days would be too short.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Who will decide what is to constitute "any material omission or misstatement of any of the particulars required by the sixth section of the principal Act"? Two lawyers may give different opinions and both may be held by a judge to be wrong. A man may take a bill of sale which is registered and which his lawyer assures him is a good and valid document. If default is made, the goods are sold, and within three months the giver of the bill of sale becomes bankrupt, the result is that the purchaser acquires no title but becomes a trespasser. Not only is he liable for the return of the goods, but he may be liable for damages. If £1,000 worth of goods sold by public auction realised only £400 the holder of the bill of sale might have to pay the difference, although he had acted in a bona fide manner. Parliament never intended to treat borrowers or lenders in this way. I ask the Colonial Secretary to allow the clause to stand over. I desire to see the Parliamentary draftsman as I have in mind an amendment of the term "bill of sale" which will meet the case. I want to provide that when a bill of sale is given, it must be registered immediately. I think if the definition of bill of sale is amended in some slight degree, it will meet the case.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This clause was inserted at the request of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, the object being to practically abolish secret bills of sale. I recognise that the clause requires some consideration, and I shall move in accordance with the hon. member's request—

That the further consideration of the clause be postponed.

Motion passed, further consideration of the clause postponed.

Clauses 8, 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Repeal of Section 46:

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I hope the House will not pass the clause. I do not think it is the general wish that Section 46 should be repealed. The matter has already been referred to at length.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	5
Noes	17
				—
Majority against	12
				—

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. E. Dodd	(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller).

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Form of bill of sale:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: This clause goes out. I understood this was inserted to meet the case of the small borrowers.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Oh, no.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Fees:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: There can be no good reason for increasing the fees for the registration of a bill of sale, because, as has already been pointed out,

stamp duty is paid. Stamp duty is paid when we mortgage land, or borrow money under a bill of sale. There is no more trouble over the registration of a bill of sale of £500 than there is over one of £1,000. It is far better that the Government should fix one fee for the registration, no matter the amount.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This is not a new principle. In connection with the Companies' Act, the fees are in proportion to the capital of the company.

Hon. W. Patrick: Is not that stamp duty?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Direct fees must be paid in proportion to the capital.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: In this case a man has to borrow because he is in needy circumstances, whereas a man who registers a transfer of land for many thousands of pounds does not come under the same category. Fees should not be increased in the case of people who have to borrow in this manner. If we do this we are penalising a deserving class.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 15, 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Amendment of Section 18, Bills of Sale Amendment Act, 1906:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN moved an amendment—

That in line 8 of paragraph (b) the word "or" be struck out and after the word "twine" the words "all necessities of life" be inserted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would like the hon. member to explain why he wants the amendment inserted.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I am quite willing to accept different words if they express my intention, which is to protect the food of the borrower. Because of the necessity of seed, fertilisers, bags and twine, for the production of a man's living, the Bill proposes to allow these things to come under a bill of sale without notice. While that protects the merchant who is helping the farmer with seed and fertilisers, the storekeeper, who has to supply him with something much more vital to him, has not the same protection. I am quite willing to take the word "sus-

tenance" or "food" instead of the more general phrase "necessaries of life."

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I think we should pass the clause as it stands. A storekeeper would possibly be unable to give a farmer seed and bags and fertiliser to enable him to put in his crop. Yet that storekeeper would have a better chance of being paid if the farmer had assistance to put in his crop. If we go on to provide specially for sustenance we do not quite know where it will end. I think, therefore, the clause is a good one.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Such an amendment would be attended with grave danger, because it could not be confined to the farmer alone. If it is a good thing at all it should be extended to the whole community. A farmer gives a bill of sale over his crop for the purpose of getting seed wheat and fertiliser with which to sow that crop. Unless the amendment was confined to the farmer alone, which is impracticable, I am certain it would lead to grave abuses, for any person in the community could then give a bill of sale without notice.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I understood the necessity for the Bill lay in the fact that, under existing legislation, a man could give a secret bill of sale and still get credit, and at the eleventh hour the man holding the secret bill of sale could come in and take everything against the other creditors. In the first portion of the Bill it is proposed to do away with secret bills of sale, but here it is proposed to give the farmer power to give a bill of sale without registration.

The Colonial Secretary: No, it must be registered, but he need not give notice of his intention to register.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Why should he not?

The Colonial Secretary: The squatter is not required to give notice.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Because he only gives a lien over his wool or his stock, and he may have many other assets. Under the Bill it is proposed to give the Government preference over all other creditors. The merchants do not care what legislation is passed so long as they are all on the same footing, but

to give one section power to register a bill of sale without notice while all other sections have to give notice, is to create a very bad condition of affairs.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's remarks apply to the clause as a whole rather than to the amendment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Under existing legislation it is not necessary for a squatter to give notice of the registration of a bill of sale covering stock, sheep or wool. We propose to slightly extend that principle. Where a merchant decides to advance to a selector seed wheat or fertiliser in order to enable him to sow a crop, it is provided that it will not be necessary to give notice of the intention to register a bill of sale. The Government will not advance if they have to give notice of intention, which provides opportunity for any person to come along and block the registration and prevent the farmer from putting in his crop.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Every machinery merchant could stop the registration.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, and the hands of the Government would be tied. This is simply to put the farmer on the same plane as the squatter, although not to the same extent, because this will only apply where the Government or a merchant supplies fertiliser for the purpose of putting in a crop.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: In view of the fuller light which the Colonial Secretary has thrown on the question, I beg to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) be struck out.

I object to the attempt to place the officials of the Government on a different plane from that of the ordinary creditor, and I object to a provision which, simply because a man is borrowing money to put in his crop, seeks to exempt him from giving notice of intention to register. The principle of giving notice is a sound one. If it is generally recognised in the Act of 1906, why should an exception be made here? The

Colonial Secretary has said that an exception has been made in the case of a squatter giving a bill of sale over his wool or stock. But there may be very good reasons for that, because the squatter has other assets to be looked to. Again, we all know the great difficulty a squatter would have in giving notice of intention to register a bill of sale over chattels located in a remote part of the State. But I cannot see why the principle should be departed from in the case of a farmer. If he owes money all round, why should he be allowed to hand over his crop to somebody else?

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: You want to take away a man's chance of getting a crop.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: No. It is proposed rather to take away the means a creditor has of entering a caveat. I see no reason why different people should be placed in a different position as, under the clause, they are sought to be.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: An ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory. In recent seasons the creditors have frequently made advances to enable a farmer to put in a crop, in the hope that he would be able to pay his debts to them. Several cases have recently come under my notice in which the creditors have said, "We have stood by you for one or two years, but we cannot do it any longer." Therefore, unless the farmer gets help, and unless the one who is to give him help is able to take security, the farmer cannot put in a crop this year. Many farmers have been unable to put in a crop because unable to secure fertiliser, seed, or bags. We have had bad seasons, and if someone is willing to take the risk of the farmer getting a crop, surely it is in the interests of the community and of the other creditors also, that the farmer should be given one more chance. It is a wise provision.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: What about the latter part of the clause which exempts any bill of sale?

Hon. C. SOMMERS: A bill of sale is only given over the amount which the seed, bags and fertiliser represent. A £100 worth of seed and fertiliser might

produce £500 worth of produce. I think it is on all fours with the privileges which the squatter already possesses. If it is wise to give it to him it is wise to give it here.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: A man cannot exist on bags, fertiliser and seed wheat. Mr. Sommers said that the farmers have come to a standstill and cannot go on any further, but that they will be able to do so if you give them bags, fertiliser and seed wheat. But how is that going to get them on? We know that the merchant is carrying the storekeeper and the storekeeper is carrying the small farmer. The merchant and the storekeeper have this protection that no man can give his assets away without giving notice of the registration of the bill of sale. If you take that power away from the merchant to protect himself there will be no food for the farmer and no means of existence for him. He will probably get from the Government his seed wheat, fertiliser and bags, but he will have nothing to exist on because the merchants will not help him. He will probably have to eat the seed wheat which he would have planted.

Hon. C. Sommers: That is rather far-fetched.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I favour the amendment moved by Mr. Gawler. I can see if this clause is put in there is a very grave danger to the farming community. It means cutting away all the privileges of securing credit. You cannot expect any merchant to extend the credit system to the farming community without the protection afforded by the registration of bills of sale.

The Colonial Secretary: They have to be registered.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: After the damage is done. No merchant is going to stand in the way of the farmer's securing seed wheat, fertiliser, etc., to put into the ground. He knows there will some chance of getting the money returned to him. If this clause is put there it means the granting of preference to those who supply only small commodities needed by the farming community, and also to the department. I do not think this is a fair thing. I think grave injustice would be

done if the clause were included in the Bill.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: We are losing sight of the fact that the farmers would have other assets, such as implements and stock. There is nothing to prevent the storekeeper and others taking security over them. The great advantage of this clause is that it enables a farmer to grow a crop whereas otherwise he might be unable to get the necessary seed. We must not lose sight of that fact.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It may not be generally known to members of the House that at the present time there is an arrangement in existence which was brought into vogue by Mr. Sutton, acting on behalf of the Seed Wheat Board and the Chamber of Commerce. An arrangement was first entered into in July, 1913, and it was proposed by this to arrange for the equal distribution of the crop between the merchants and the Government in order that the supply of seed wheat, etc., should be brought about. That was not satisfactory, and later on they again met Mr. Sutton, and an arrangement was made by consent of the Chamber of Commerce and the Seed Wheat Board for the present season. That is at the present time in vogue, and I understand was mutually arrived at and arranged between Mr. Sutton, acting on behalf of the Minister for Agriculture and the Seed Wheat Board, and the Chamber of Commerce. It seems to me premature to put in a clause such as we have here at this particular stage, when we have under consideration at the present time an arrangement which has been amicably arrived at between these experts. It seems to be the desire of the leader of the House to put this clause through, but in view of the information which I have at my disposal, I have no alternative but to oppose the subclause, and I shall therefore have to vote that it should be deleted.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Some hon. members lose sight of the fact that the first portion of this subclause, at any rate, is only to provide security for the amount of the purchase money of the seed, fertiliser, bags and twine, and for the growing crop and nothing else. A

man cannot take security over anything more than the purchase money. If a man takes more than this the transaction is no good; he cannot get security.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: There is very often not much say about a crop.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: He can only take security for the value of the seed or fertiliser or bags and twine, whatever it may be. If a man only lends £50 he cannot take £500 worth of goods under his bill of sale. That enables a farmer to put in his crop which he could not do without that assistance. Most of the farmers, of course, have other assets beside the crop. They have first of all their machinery on a hire agreement. What is to prevent any machinery merchant lodging a caveat against that bill of sale, although he is secured under his hire agreement? Judging from the attitude of certain very large firms in Perth towards the farmers they do not deserve any consideration from this House. I know of one firm in particular, and every time you take up the writ list you see nothing but writs issued by this firm against farmers for the unpaid instalments on agricultural machinery. Surely a firm like that will not give any consideration to the farmers if they seek to register a bill of sale. There certainly is objection to the latter part of the subclause starting from the words "or to any bill of sale granted before or after," etc. I do not see that a farmer should give a bill of sale to the Minister for Agriculture over all his assets for the purchase of seed, fertiliser, etc., and at the same time that the private individual should be excluded. Why place the Government in a better position than the private individual? I would like the Colonial Secretary to tell us why he seeks to do that. That is the only objection I have to this subclause. I intend to vote for the first portion, reserving to myself the right to vote as I think fit after hearing the leader of the House on the question.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Actions speak louder than words. The action of the Government shows that what they have done in the past has been in the interests of the agriculturists

generally. No less than £90,000 has been advanced in connection with the supply of seed wheat, fertiliser, etc., by the Agricultural Department.

Hon. W. Patriek: How much did the Government get back?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Very little. The difference between the Government and the private individual ought to be apparent to everyone. The Government is not here to crush the farmer, but to assist him and make him prosper. If the Government decide to take a bill of sale over any of his assets, it is solely with the object of assisting him. That ought to be evident. I am surprised at the opposition to this clause from representatives of agricultural districts. This is a proposal to solve a very great difficulty which is facing us now, and which will continue to face us, and in a very much fiercer form before very long. It will be necessary to assist many more agriculturists in Western Australia than we have assisted in the past. The Government will assist them, not with the object of defrauding other creditors, but with the object of placing them in a position to pay those creditors. This is how we propose to do it. We do not wish to be harassed at every turn. We shall be dealing perhaps with thousands of farmers in Western Australia, and we do not wish to be harassed by creditors lodging an objection to the registration of any bill of sale.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I appreciate the objection raised by Mr. Gawler and Mr. Baxter. I say, however, they are very small things compared with the object of the Bill. The Government are face to face with a serious position. It would be a terrible position if the Government were held up by anyone who simply chose to say "Sink or swim; I want to get my pound of flesh out of the farmer." It is essential that the Government as representing the whole of the people, and the merchant who comes forward to tide the farmer over to his next crop, should be treated as the special friends of the farmer, and that the farmer should have the opportunity of being thus helped by the Government and

the merchant to do his duty towards his other creditors. I shall vote for the clause with all my heart.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Mr. Jenkins just now remarked that if a person came along and said, "I want to put in a crop," and merely borrowed seed wheat and fertilisers for the purpose of putting in the crop, there was no harm. I think, however, my honourable friend has overlooked the fact that this clause provides for bills of sale not only over crops about to be sown, but over crops actually existing. Under this clause, the farmer would be able to borrow on the security of a growing crop, thus taking away the security of his creditors. Another point made by Mr. Jenkins was with reference to hire purchase agreements, that a merchant could come along and lodge a caveat. Under hire purchase agreements, however, payment is by instalments, and a caveat cannot be lodged unless payments are overdue. It appears to me that the Government are forgetting the men who carry on the farmers; that is, the storekeeper and the merchant. The Government appear to think that if they stand behind the farmer, that is all he requires. I still object strongly to the clause.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The more the clause is examined, the more serious it becomes. The leader of the House said the Government had already advanced seed wheat, fertilisers, etcetera, to the value of £90,000. Mr. Duffell says the money has been advanced by arrangement between the merchants and the Government. Now the Government propose to come in and shelter themselves under this clause. The merchants have been helping the Government to carry these farmers on.

The Colonial Secretary: Nothing of the kind. The Government have found £90,000.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: And the merchants and storekeepers have found perhaps £200,000. It is thought that possibly the season will be a failure, but we must not assume that. It is not a failure yet. The crops are only just coming up. Mr. Sommers says these farmers are "up

against it," and have no money to buy seed wheat; but they will have their own seed wheat. I may point out that attempts have been made in this State to grow wheat where there is no hope of ever growing it. The sooner the system of sending people out into the back country where they have no chance of success is put a stop to, the better; and the sooner the Government are prevented from wasting seed wheat and fertilisers in such districts, the better also. Fearing a bad season, the Government now propose to protect themselves and leave the merchants in the cold. A merchant who wished to register a bill of sale is quite satisfied to give 14 days' notice, and the Government should be in the same position. I shall vote for the exclusion of the clause. If there had been any doubt in my mind at all, the very fact of the Minister's admitting that the Government have advanced £90,000 and now want to protect themselves and leave everyone else in the cold would be quite sufficient justification for the rejection of the clause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I cannot allow the misrepresentation to go forth that the Government want to protect themselves at the expense of everyone else.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You want to come in without the notice which everyone else has to give.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This clause refers to future crops, to crops about to be sown or grown. In many cases where notice of intention to register was not given, the bills of sale are invalid.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: So they should be.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then the country will be left to suffer. I am given to understand that in the early stages of the system of assistance to farmers, sufficient care was not taken to observe legal technicalities. This clause validates all bills of sale registered in the past in connection with which notice of intention was not given.

Hon. E. McLARTY: This is a very good clause, and I intend to support it.

If the Government advance seed wheat and fertilisers to settlers not in a position to procure them otherwise, that is in itself material assistance to the storekeeper and the merchant towards getting the money owing by the farmer to them. With a reasonable crop the farmer is in a position to pay back his advances and make a surplus of £1 per acre, which will enable him to pay his accounts. I agree with Mr. Sommers that a good many settlers have been unable to crop at all this season. Someone has to come to the rescue. I do not think this clause prejudices the storekeeper or the merchant in the least, and I can see no danger in it.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	13

Majority against	..	5
------------------	----	---

AYES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. D. G. Gawler
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. W. Patrick

(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. V. Hamersley	

(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I look upon this clause as a particularly good one, but I feel that we should not give the Government a preference over private traders or companies. It is realised that the Government have made liberal advances to the farming community, and I hope that they will be in a position to make still further advances, because we have a number of new settlers engaged in the industry and every point must be stretched to keep them growing wheat now. I realise also that the fertiliser firms have extended to these settlers even greater consideration than the Government have shown them. Under the clause

as it stands, the fertiliser firms would probably be forestalled; and I therefore move as an amendment—

That the words at the end of paragraph (b), "or to any bill of sale granted before or after the commencement of this Act to the Minister for Agriculture or any officer of the Department of Agriculture" be struck out.

That does not refer simply to the granting of corn for sowing crops. It refers to any bill of sale, of whatever nature. Fertilisers, for example, are just as necessary as seed wheat is to the growing of a crop. Again I know of firms who have granted consideration to farmers by advancing them horses to pull their machinery, without which the seed wheat could not have been put in. Then, the storekeeper, by arrangement with the seed wheat board, has kept the farmer supplied with the necessities of life; and therefore the storekeeper is equally entitled to protection. I hope the Minister will be able to see that the amendment I have moved is reasonable.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The object of the latter portion of the clause to which Mr. Hamersley objects does not appear to be clearly understood. It is not to exempt the Minister for Agriculture from registering a bill of sale; this is provided for, but it is to relieve him of the necessity of giving notice of his intention to register. This privilege is now enjoyed by the squatters and those who produce wool and stock. Members must realise that the Department of Agriculture, in making advances, is not there to make a profit, but to assist the selector. Mr. Sutton has charge of the department and is assisted by a board. Every case is scrupulously investigated and if relief is considered necessary, it is granted. It has been stated that the Government would swoop down and take the lot. It would be impossible for them to do so. In order that the bill of sale should be valid it would be necessary for them to make a contemporaneous advance. If it was a bill

of sale for £100 they would have to make an advance of £100. But it would have to be registered for six months before it would stand good, and any person who objected to it on the ground that it was covered by an antecedent debt could take steps to get it rendered null and void. If Mr. Hamersley's amendment is carried, it will limit the power of the Government. There may be cases where it may be necessary to assist the farmer by taking a bill of sale over his crop; it may be necessary to provide the farmer with food. Directly the Minister for Agriculture gives notice of his intention to register the bill of sale, all and sundry will come down and enter objections.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: It is the object of the 1906 Act that they should be able to do so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is only since 1906 that the law has provided for the notification of intention to register a bill of sale. Previously there was no necessity to give notice. It could be registered straight away.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then you are going back to the original position?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, we are extending it from the squatter to the farmer, who was not largely in existence at that time, and it was not then considered necessary to extend it to the farmer.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: This clause will infringe the principle of the Bills of Sale Act Amendment Act of 1906, which introduced the principle, rightly or wrongly, but which has worked well up to the present time, that every one should register a bill of sale and give other creditors an opportunity to raise any objection to it. If the Minister introduces this new principle, and allows a Government department to take a bill of sale over any property, he will be introducing a very wide reading into the amending Act of 1906. If the clause were restricted to an advance for the purpose of enabling a man to grow his crop, there might be something to be said in its favour, but this is going very much further. It is perfectly open for the Government to secure themselves at the present time in

regard to debts which otherwise would be bad, and all they have to do is to carry the farmer on for six months, when their debt will prevail against all other creditors. The other creditors cannot come in unless they make a man bankrupt.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is easy.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: No. It is necessary to show that he is unable to pay his debts, and the Government debt is maturing and obtaining preference for the Government over other creditors. The more I consider the latter portion of this clause, the more I consider it is unjust to the other creditors, for surely those who have carried on these farmers, and they have had to depend on the good offices of the merchants and storekeepers, should be considered as against the Government. If the Government have made bad debts, surely they should be under the same restrictions as any ordinary creditor. I cannot see the necessity for this very wide preference for the payment of the Government.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Mr. Gawler has made a fine legal, cold business argument. I had noted down the very amendment which Mr. Hamersley has moved, but refrained from moving it because I realised the position. Mr. Gawler is looking at only one small part of the case. If he were fully seized with the position he would drop the argument. An enormous number of settlers could to-morrow be proved bankrupt, and would, therefore, be at the mercy of any creditor.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: You are going to make the creditors make the settler bankrupt.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Any creditor who goes for his own pound of flesh could make a settler bankrupt. Why did the Government step in to save the eastern farmers? They acted as representatives of the whole body politic to help a weak element at the time. They did so hastily, as a matter of benevolence largely, and without looking closely into the position. It is not only for the Government's sake, or for the sake of the body politic, that the Government are now proposing to legalise that action, and put themselves into a strong position in regard to future

acts of the kind, but also for the sake of the farmers themselves. Their action is intended to save any need to press the farmers. This is a case in which the broad interest triumphs over little legal technicalities, or even cold business considerations. In all our legislation we regard the Government as the whole body politic. They will nurse these needy settlers in the interests of all their creditors, and make it possible for them to pay the creditors in full. Mr. Gawler contends that the Government should come in like any common creditor. The hon. member has not studied the matter sufficiently. It will be a calamity if the Committee fail to pass the clause.

Hon. W. Patrick: A calamity to the farmers, you mean.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Yes, and to the country, because the farmers are at the foundation of the country's prosperity.

Hon. W. Patrick: Of course they are, and they do not want this.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It would be a mistake for the Committee to allow small considerations to weigh against large humanitarian and public aspects of the question, and I hope Mr. Hamersley will withdraw from his position.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: Storekeepers have been carrying the farmers on their shoulders, and the Government are in the position of an individual who takes a security over practically the whole of the available assets of the farmers.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: No, they take the position of the whole country.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: They take the position of a secured creditor. I object to it being left to the sweet will of the Government when they have realised on the assets to whack them out among the various creditors.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: They need not do that.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: It is at the sweet will of the Government, and that is what I do not like. If I were sure that the Government would come in only as an ordinary creditor, I would welcome the clause, but I do not like the idea of placing

in the hands of the Government the power of distributing the assets among the various creditors.

The Colonial Secretary: There is no provision to that effect.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There is no guarantee that any one will get anything from the Government.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: No. The Government are in the position of one man who has everything mortgaged to him and it is at his sweet will whether he pays the others or not. Further than this, the power is to be retrospective and we will be legalising bills of sale which, strictly speaking, were not legal before. I wish to assist the farmers all I can, but I desire that a fair thing shall be done by the farmers' creditors, including the Government. If the Government say they will realise the available assets and pay a dividend to the other creditors and treat them properly, I will have no objection to the clause, but we have not got this assurance.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It has been stated that there was an honourable understanding among merchants, storekeepers, and Mr. Sutton representing the Government, that these farmers would be carried on, the Government providing the seed wheat and the merchants supplying the other wherewithal. Now the proposal is not that the merchants should come in and get their pound of flesh, but that the Government should take the pound of flesh. This is intended to apply to past and present bills of sale.

The Colonial Secretary: It would not hold good until the expiration of six months.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Future advances, too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This covers any bill of sale which the Government might choose to take.

The Colonial Secretary: They must give consideration for it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The fact remains that there is an honourable understanding that these people shall be carried on, and the only party seeking their pound of flesh are the Government. When there is such an understanding and

one party propose to depart from it and take all there is, the other parties are forced to protect themselves. If the Government are going to protect themselves under this Bill, the business men will want to come in straight away to divide the pound of flesh.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: We must not forget that the Government already hold security as against other creditors; they hold the land that these people are settled on. It is unfair for the Government, holding the security they do, to take a distinct advantage over others who have been standing in with them to enable the farmer to grow his crop. The agreements which have been entered into have already, in many instances, placed the people who gave them in an unenviable position, and in a measure have destroyed their credit in the country. Mr. Baxter could give instances where men who have assigned their crops to the department had found that they had made a blunder.

The Colonial Secretary: They would have had no crops but for the Government.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: And there would have been no crops if some of the firms had not furnished these people with supplies. They took it for granted that the Government would act fairly by them when they produced their crops. The Government have the power to cancel the leases if rents are not paid, but here we propose to give still further advantage which is not necessary. The proposal is not going to work out in the way the Government wish. I have every sympathy with these men, and I have every confidence that the intention of the Government is to do the best they can for the settlers, but I must also recognise that when this action was taken some time ago many of these people were placed in an unenviable position.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: This very clause is protecting the Government for past debts; it applies to bills of sale before the passing of the Act, and validates those bills of sale. It is pointed out that the merchants and creditors to whom debts are owing, can protect them-

selves during the six months. Are we not then forcing them to make the farmer bankrupt so that they may protect themselves? If the Government take a bill of sale in connection with a past debt, the creditor will say "Here is a bill of sale for a past debt owing to the Government; we must make the man bankrupt." The more one looks at this clause, the more its far-reaching effects are seen. It is going to encourage the Government to launch out in these undertakings in regard to farmers, and encourage the farmers to do so. If the undertakings are going to lead to disaster, it is better that we should now say that the Government should not be able to do this.

Hon. W. PATRICK: I voted for the deletion of the whole of the subclause, because I did not approve of it, but apparently it is the opinion of the House that a bill of sale should be given to secure payment for seed wheat, etc. The final paragraph, however, refers to anything. It will include rent due to the Government or money due to the Agricultural Bank. I do not think that will be of advantage to the farmer.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I say emphatically that a bill of sale will not apply to a past debt until six months after the registration. There would be ample opportunity in that period for any creditor to take action. I do not intend to speak one further word in support of this measure after I sit down. I have put the position clearly. If a large number of farmers in Western Australia are unable to receive that relief which will be necessary in certain circumstances the blame must rest with those who intend to vote against this particular clause. The Government have no intention to grant advances if they are obliged to notify the intention to register, for the reason that they do not propose to take a bill of sale over anyone's property for a past debt. They could do so, but it could be upset within six months of the date of registration. This particular clause deals simply with notice of intention, and it is useless for anyone to say it goes further, and that the Government intend to swoop down and seize the lot. I hope hon.

members will weigh my words, and be prepared to bear the responsibility if the Government recognise the utter impossibility of dealing with the thousands of cases that will arise if on every occasion they have to register a notice of intention.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister cannot alter my views. The beginning of the clause provides that the Government can supply seed wheat and fertilisers and now the Government require the power to protect themselves against all other creditors for a past action.

The Colonial Secretary: You can put no such construction on it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Immediately it is found that the Government can protect themselves against other creditors, nothing will remain but for those other creditors to come in and share the dividend out of whatever assets there might be. I want the Government to respect the honourable understanding they have entered into.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	10
Noes	6

Majority for	..	4
--------------	----	---

AYES.

Hon. H. Carson	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. F. Baxter

(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. H. Millington

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 18—Bills of sale void against claims for wages:

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I propose to ask the Committee to strike out the clause. I have already drawn attention to the various privileges the worker enjoys, and to the exceedingly far-reaching effects of the clause.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I move an amendment—

That after "grantor" in line 6 the words "not being a member of the grantor's family" be inserted.

I think this would remove some of the objections to the clause. Wages to the extent of one month should be protected, but I do not think it should be competent to bring in claims on behalf of the whole of the family.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What is your definition of "grantor's family"?

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: His wife and children.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Surely if the farmer has two or three sons engaged in the industry, and they have been employed by him during the currency of that month, they should be entitled to a month's protection.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I think the clause covers a good deal more than the framers of the Bill intended. They only intended it to cover such claims for wages as might be in question, but under the clause the proceeds of the sale, although it might be £1,000, shall be held and regarded as a debt due from the grantee to the grantor. I move an amendment—

That after "purpose" in line 16 the words "and to the extent of such wages" be inserted.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: The provision that it should be a debt due from the grantee to the grantor is to satisfy the legal machinery. Whether there is any legal objection to the amendment I do not know. I cannot see it myself.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I hope the clause will not be agreed to. Suppose a man lends £100 on the horses on a farm. The farmer may owe 10 men a month's wages, amounting to perhaps £50, and they may come in and claim before the vendor can get his money. The advance of £100 was made specifically on the horses, and had nothing whatever to do with the work done by those 10 men. I hope the clause will be negatived.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause is very different from what it was when previously submitted to the Committee; then it covered all wages due, whereas now it covers only one month's wages. Under the law relating to landlord and tenant this principle is recognised, and so too under the Bankruptcy and Companies Acts a man who is paid a salary is protected up to £50, while the wages man is protected to the extent of £25. There are many instances in which persons have given bills of sale over their cattle and subsequently defrauded their workmen of their wages. This will provide some measure of protection to the workmen.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: The workman cannot well be defrauded of his wages with all the remedies he has at present on the statute-book. Wages are bound to be paid every week at the risk to the employer of a penalty. In addition there is the Truck Act and the Workmen's Wages Lien Act, and on top of all these the worker can proceed summarily in the police court under the Masters and Servants Act, whereas the ordinary creditor has to proceed in the local court. Moreover the worker can recover his wages by distress on the employer's goods. It will discourage all assistance given to struggling storekeepers or anyone who wishes to get a small sum to carry him on. No one will be able to lend money unless he looks at a man's wages sheet and makes sure that there are no wages owing by him and that there are no arrears beyond the extent of one month. It is more far reaching even than that. It allows goods sold over the counter to be followed to the house of the person who buys them. That could not have been intended, and some provision will have to be put in to prevent this kind of thing.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Mr. Gawler drew a picture of the various laws of which the worker could avail himself, but he has failed to draw attention to one point. If all the assets of an employer are covered by a bill of sale, then the worker has no remedy and cannot get his money. If the employer can carry on

and meet the interest on a bill of sale, he can still deny the workman what is owing and the amount cannot be recovered. He might get a verdict under some of the laws which have been spoken of.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: He could prosecute if the employer does not pay every week.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, and possibly put him in gaol, but does that insure the workman getting any of his money? If the workman is successful in forcing the employer into the bankruptcy court, then the workman would take preference over those who hold a bill of sale. That cannot be denied.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: He could get an order.

Hon. J. CORNELL: But nothing on the order.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	8
				—
Majority for	1
				—

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. H. Briggs	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Carson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller.)
Hon. E. McLarty	

Clause thus passed.

Clause 19—Amendment of the schedule:

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Will the Colonial Secretary report progress at this stage? I intended to move an amendment to the last clause to provide for what I considered to be a flaw in it. I would also like to see the Crown Solicitor and the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move an amendment on a clause that is passed.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I shall have to do it on recommitment then.

Clause put and passed.
Progress reported.

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.23] in moving the second reading said: This is the third occasion on which this Bill has been before the House. It has been debated from cover to cover, and I therefore intend to make my remarks as brief as possible. I am well aware that there are several new members of the House now who were not in the House when the Bill was formerly under consideration, but nearly all, if not all of these, take a deep interest in agriculture and must be acquainted with the principle of the Bill which will be under consideration this evening. All I think must realise the necessity for the encouragement of irrigation. The dairy products imported to Western Australia last year amounted to £975,143, and butter alone amounted to £468,000. That means that we have been sending out of the State £1,300 a day for butter alone. I think all will admit that the South-West is admirably adapted for the carrying out of irrigation schemes. No less than 300,000 acres valued at £100,000 are already under irrigation in that part of the State. By locking the Serpentine, the Harvey, the Murray, the Collie and the Brunswick rivers, no less than 450,000 acres would be rendered suitable for intense culture if irrigation schemes were formulated. But it is impossible to carry out irrigation schemes without some provision for the regulation of the rights in natural waters. Last year there were four principles upon which the Council disagreed with the Assembly. I want, Mr. President, to make my remarks as concise as possible and will dwell briefly upon each point. First let me take the question of beds. The Government wish to vest the right to the beds of rivers in the Crown, but only in such cases where these rivers form the boundary of a man's land. In such cases, that is

where the river forms the boundary of the adjacent land, the owner of the adjacent land has no freehold rights to that bed. He has only, as I have repeatedly said before, in accordance, not exactly with the English law, but with English custom, the right to the usage of that bed. He could use it for grazing or for cultivation purposes. He can do that now and could still do so under the Bill.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: No!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is definitely expressed. If it was Mr. Cullen who said "no" I can scarcely believe it of him. It is definitely expressed in the Bill that he can use the bed. Of course he cannot use it if there is any water in it, but where there is no water in it he can use the soil for the purposes of cultivation.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Unless the Government want to use it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He has that definite right. Of course if the Government intend to carry out an irrigation scheme and have to construct irrigation works, they will have to go on the beds and that is one of the reasons for the introduction of the Bill. Under this measure the owner of the land adjacent to the beds has every right that he possessed before with one exception, and that right, which it is proposed to take away from him, is the right to sue the Crown for trespass.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: Will you compensate him if you take the bed away?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, it is not his property in fee simple. If a river is running through his property and the Government want the bed they must resume it and pay for it, but where it forms the boundary of a man's land and is not his property in fee simple, the Government simply take away from him the right of suing for trespass if the Government go upon that bed. The owner of the land can still use the bed when the water is off it, and can still sue anyone else except the Crown who trespasses on the bed. It may be, and must be, that the Government should construct irrigation works, and unless they were protected in this way, it would be impossible

for them to do so without running the risk of an action for damages. In Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland, they have not only taken the beds of rivers, but also the banks in order that they may be protected in carrying out the scheme.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: How are they getting on with them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Famously. They have gone in very largely for closer settlement. The Governments of New South Wales and Victoria have purchased large estates and have cut them up in a successful manner.

Hon. W. Patrick: They are losing money by the hundred pounds every day.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Under the former schemes, where the land was held in large areas, and consequently there was little settlement, irrigation was not a success; but now, thanks to the closer settlement schemes adopted by the Governments, there is every indication that it will be a complete success. The leasehold system was another point of difference. This House offered its objection to the leasehold system. The reason for the introduction of the leasehold principle into the Bill was, especially, to prevent the aggregation of large estates, which would be encouraged under the freehold system.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Might not there be a large leasehold?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: As regards a large leasehold, I do not think it would be desirable to give any one man a large block even under leasehold, because the object of the Government should be to settle on irrigated country as many families as possible. There has been bitter experience of the freehold system in Western Australia in connection with the Lands Purchase Act. Pastoral leases were resumed and large amounts were paid to the squatters in connection with the resumptions, and the land was subsequently cut up and thrown open to settlement. With the assistance of dummies, however, the land was again taken up by the squatters; and after a lapse of 7 years it was sold back to the Government again at an enormous in-

crease upon the price at which it was originally sold.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: If you can limit leasehold, you can limit freehold.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If we adopted the freehold principle, it would mean that later on the whole of the estates purchased, after being cut up and subdivided, would probably get into the hands of about a dozen people. That state of affairs is not likely to arise under the leasehold system.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: You can limit the one as well as the other.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It has been proved in practice that although the acreage of freehold may be limited there is, nevertheless, a tendency to build up large estates. Indeed, that is going on now. Even for the third time there has been a proposition submitted to the Government to purchase and subdivide land that had already, twice before, been purchased by them and cut up.

Hon. W. Patrick: That should not be. It shows how foolish the Government have been.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Now, as regards the third point of difference, that regulations can be annulled only by a vote of both Houses. That is what the Government wished, and what the Legislative Council did not desire. The Council thought that it should be within the power of one House to annul these regulations. Now, it must be remembered that the regulations need to be in conformity with the Act, otherwise they would be *ultra vires* and legal action could be taken to prevent their operation. The Bill would be passed by both Houses, and I maintain that disallowance of the regulations should rest with both Houses.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But either House could disallow the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Either House could disallow the Bill. But suppose the Bill was passed; that would mean that both Houses had agreed to it. Then we go on for perhaps a dozen years. The personnel of this House is changed: a new Legislative Council comes in. The Government of the day frame a regulation strictly in conformity with the

Act, with the object of carrying the Act into force, and strictly in conformity with the intentions of this Chamber as constituted at the present time. Perhaps 12 years hence a regulation of that kind might be framed, and a new Legislative Council annul that regulation because its members were not in sympathy with the measure. That would be giving to the one House the power, practically, to repeal the Act, a power which would be enjoyed under those circumstances by only one Chamber. Now, as regards proclaiming the Act to apply to certain districts, giving the Government power, if necessary, to proclaim the Act throughout the State. At first sight there is not much objection to that provision, but it does throw the whole of the responsibility on the Government of the day. If it is a good thing that the rights in natural waters in one particular part of the State should vest in the Crown, then it is a good thing that the same should be the case throughout the State.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But would it not be better to prove the Act in one district, and then prove it in another?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: But this is a question of vesting in the Crown the rights in natural waters. We might commence with a district in which irrigation would be carried on upon an extensive scale, and vest the rights in natural waters of that particular district in the Crown; but that would not prevent the trouble which is now being created in all parts of the State where a settler is irrigating from a small stream, perhaps an acre of fruit trees. Under those conditions, litigation is almost certain to follow if a settler lower down the stream complains. There is the case of the Narrogin Brook. I do not think Narrogin is an irrigation district.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Was not that the only case?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Irrigation is carried on there to a limited extent, and we know that, in connection with the Narrogin Brook there was a very expensive law case, the cost of which must have run into £1,000 or £1,200. The case went first before a Supreme Court

judge, then before the Full Court, and then before the High Court. Therefore, it is really difficult to say what district of the State this measure should not extend to; and so it seems that the best thing to do is to give the Government the power to control the whole of the waters of the State. Parliament should take the responsibility and say, "We will vest the rights in natural waters throughout the State in the Crown, and not ask the Government of the day to take the responsibility in that respect." Now, when this Bill was before the House last year, the Government gave way on a large number of points. I think it was on 17 points the Government gave way. On the other hand, the Council would not budge one inch. That, I think, was due to some misunderstanding. Indeed, I am almost certain it was due to misunderstanding, because many hon. members apparently were under the impression that the Bill would eventually go to managers representing each House.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: To a conference.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A conference of managers.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Why did it not?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I cannot say why it did not. I do know that on no single point did the Legislative Council give way as regards the Irrigation Bill of last session. The Government gave way on 16 or 17 amendments, and all those amendments have been embodied in the Bill now under consideration.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Then it is so much better.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: All the amendments desired by the Council have been embodied, excepting the four points on which the Council offered strong opposition, and on which the Government refused to give way.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Is this a non-controversial measure?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think so. I have endeavoured to make it as little controversial as possible, and I sincerely hope that there will not be a long debate on the second reading. This is a Committee Bill. It has already

passed through Committee on two occasions in this Chamber, and I hope that, except as regards new members, there will be very little discussion so far as the second reading is concerned, but that the measure will be carefully gone into at the Committee stage. If there is any likelihood of lengthy discussion the Government will be obliged to drop the Bill. If the discussion is going to take three weeks or a month, it will be impossible to give the measure consideration.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: What does the Minister think?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	8
				—
A tie	0
				—

AYES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. D. G. Cawler	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. McKenzie

(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. R. G. Ardagh

(Teller).

The PRESIDENT: I give my casting vote to the ayes, so that there may be time for further consideration.

Motion thus passed, the debate adjourned.

BILL—KINGIA GRASS TREE CONCESSION CONFIRMATION.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [S.44] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to ratify an agreement entered into be-

tween Mr. Emanuel Francis Benjamin and the Government for the granting to Mr. Benjamin of an exclusive right, for a period of 21 years, to remove and utilise, for the purpose of converting them into any commercial product, all the Kingia grass trees on 500,000 acres of land in the Melbourne and Wellington districts. Mr. Benjamin first approached the Agricultural Department in September, 1910, for a concession for the cutting of Kingia grass trees on all Crown lands in the South-West. He was offered the right to cut on 500,000 acres at a royalty of 6d. per ton, provided that, within three months of ratification by Parliament of the agreement, a sum of £5,000 be expended on plant, implements, and so forth, and, further, that a deposit of £500 be lodged; the term of the lease to be 21 years. At a later date Cabinet decided that the agreement should provide for a substantial start within six months, that £2,500 be expended within nine months, and another £2,500 within 12 months of the ratification of the agreement. There was no departure with regard to the deposit. Owing to non-fulfilment of the conditions, the concession was cancelled in August, 1913. At a later date Mr. Benjamin again approached the department, stating that he was in a position to lodge a deposit, and asking for a reinstatement of the concession. This was agreed to, and it was decided that Mr. Benjamin should be strictly restricted to the cutting of the Kingia grass tree, as other species of blackhoy were being exploited by another person. I may point out that this lease will not interfere with the selection of land by intending selectors. Although Mr. Benjamin will have the right to take this Kingia grass tree, the land will be open for selection and may be selected by any person. If it is secured by any person for the purpose of cultivation as a conditional purchase lease or as a pastoral lease, Mr. Benjamin will have no further right to trespass on the land. I am informed that Mr. Benjamin has been very successful in producing a great variety of commercial articles from the Kingia grass tree.

The industry, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture, is well worthy of encouragement. Mr. Benjamin has to pay an amount of £250 a year for the use of the land, and a royalty of 6d. per ton on the Kingia grass removed from the land, and he has a right to select elsewhere in the State, provided the land is not held under conditional purchase lease, pastoral lease, a reserve, or other lease of occupation; in fact he must not under this agreement interfere with the rights of others.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: Is that 6d. royalty exclusive of the £250?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not certain about that. I do not propose to take the Bill into Committee until I have the information.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Has the hon. member any information to give us as to how much of the State is covered by this grass tree?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have not the information.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: You should have.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am simply moving the second reading, and any information hon. members wish for I shall be only too glad to supply. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. W. Kingsmill debate adjourned.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.49] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill for the purpose of increasing the capital of the Agricultural Bank from £4,000,000 to £4,500,000. It is usual on an occasion like this, in introducing a Bill which has for its object an increase in the capital of the Agricultural Bank, to supply hon. members with some information relative to the operations of the institution. The

amount authorised during the year was £457,718, which is to be used for the following purposes:—To pay off liabilities £16,698, to purchase stock £52,702, to purchase implements £8,179, to carry out improvements for clearing, ringbarking, poison and blackboy, fencing, draining, water conservation, fallow and buildings £380,139, or a total of £457,718. The amount advanced was £506,638 5s. 8d., making, with the amount previously advanced, a total disbursement of £3,089,575 19s. 8d. The repayments during the same period amounted to £58,635 18s. 3d., making the total amount repaid £757,616 4s. 1d. and leaving a balance outstanding at the 30th June, 1914, of £2,331,959 15s. 7d. The amount advanced has been applied under covenant with borrowers to the following purposes:—liabilities taken over for the year ended 30th June, 1914, £20,529 15s. 6d., for the purchase of stock £53,998 4s., for the purchase of plant £6,494, for the purchase of implements £8,130 3s. 1d., for the purchase of fertilisers £3,278, for developmental purposes £423,980 3s. 1d., or a total amount actually advanced for the year ended 30th June, 1914, of £506,638 5s. 8d. The amount authorised by Parliament was £4,000,000, loans approved by trustees amounted to £3,736,820, amount available for further loans £263,180, amount advanced £3,089,756, amount repaid £757,616, amount outstanding £2,331,960. The amount available for further loans is £263,180, and the amount which the Treasurer is committed to find to meet the present undertakings is £647,244. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [8.53]: I will not delay the House, but I would like the Minister to assure us that one of the first charges against the increased capital will be the completion of the payment of the half of the advances which has had to be held back. I am not necessarily asking the Government to pay this out of the new loan, but I want the Minister to give the House an assurance that the Government will, at a very early date, make good these granted

advances. The House is aware that of many granted advances only 50 per cent. was paid, and I know from other sources that the Government mean as soon as possible to pay the other 50 per cent. It is well when passing a Bill of this description that the Minister should make this announcement to us. While we know that this is not the time to go on the home market, I am satisfied the Government will have no difficulty in getting any capital wanted for the Agricultural Bank right at their own doors. The Government have power to raise it by debentures, and there will be no difficulty whatever. There are plenty of institutions which will accept debentures and put their funds at the disposal of the Government for the Agricultural Bank, but I want the Minister to tell us that the Government mean to pay the extra 50 per cent. as soon as possible, and if he can, how soon it will be paid.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [8.55]: It certainly affords a great amount of pleasure to me to find that the Government have taken this step to increase the capital of the Agricultural Bank. At the same time I do not see how they will avail themselves of the opportunity which will be given to them. I can well remember when the present Government took office they extended the limit of the Agricultural Bank, but it was some considerable time before they gave the institution enough money to carry out that extension. In fact, I do not know whether they have done so to the present day. The position with regard to the reduction of the money being advanced to the farmers is a regrettable one to find ourselves in. Their position is they have gone on the assurance of the bank and spent a certain amount of money only to find when coming forward with their certificates that they can collect only 50 per cent. We know the Government are in an awkward position, but in what position are the farmers? I would like the Colonial Secretary to give an assurance that, within the very near future, the balance of the money will be paid over. Personally, I think at a critical time like this the Government would do well to approach the heads of

the banking institutions in the State and lay the position before them, and I feel sure that in consultation with them the Government could come to some arrangement to ease the financial position. We as a State are looking to the man on the land to supply our foodstuffs. We may go to the street corners and talk patriotism as long as we like, but I maintain that our first duty in that direction is to do our best to supply the mother country and her allies with food. This war is a very serious one, and the main issue will be fought out on the food supply. I desire the Government to bear this in mind and to do all they possibly can to assist the man on the land to produce this food. I would like to see introduced in this Bill an alteration in the methods of the Agricultural Bank. In the past money has been advanced for the purpose of effecting certain improvements, and the position of the man on the land has been that he has availed himself of the money to clear his land. Consequently, there are thousands of acres of cleared land in this State which are not being utilised. The value is lying dormant in the soil instead of being operated on, and if the Agricultural Bank would advance on fallow and curtail, to a certain extent, the advances on improvements, we would be in a far sounder position than we are to-day. I hope the Government will consider this, and adopt it as one of the first improvements. I have no objection to this Bill, and I trust that if it is passed the Government will do their best to come to the assistance of the man on the land and help him to produce so that we can be patriotic in this direction as well as others.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [8.58]: I have no authority to give such an assurance as the hon. Mr. Cullen has asked for, but I was under the impression it had been distinctly announced that the balance of 50 per cent. would be forthcoming as soon as possible.

Hon. W. Patrick: Yes, very shortly.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think the hon. member realises the position the Government are in. No sane Government would borrow enough money to

keep them going for twelve months. The Agricultural Bank has now to be financed from loan funds, and it would be madness for any Government who required £1,000,000 to ask for £3,000,000 and have to pay the interest on it. When the present crisis commenced, the Government realised the position. We saw that there was no possibility of approaching the London market or any other market for a loan. Investigation showed that the Agricultural Bank had approved of loans to the extent of over £600,000, and how could the Government do otherwise than notify the farmers that owing to the crisis they could not be granted more than 50 per cent. of the amounts approved?

Hon. J. F. Cullen: They could have raised debentures.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is impossible to raise money by debentures at the present time. It must be clearly understood that the Federal authorities are only accommodating Governments that can put down a certain amount of gold.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: If you will not raise debentures how will this Bill help you?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This Bill provides only for the increase of the capital of the Bank.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The Bill will not find the money.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The measure does not make provision for the finding of the money; it simply gives us authority to borrow. If we cannot borrow the money we cannot lend it, but we stand as good a show as any other State. I am satisfied that everything will be all right.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How is it then you found yourselves in such a financial tangle during the first week of the war?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is a slander which we have heard before. We were in a good financial position when the war started, and we hope to remain so until November or December. But with the probability of a two years' war facing us we have to husband our resources. We were all right when the war started, and we are all right now,

but we have to be very careful in view of the existing state of affairs.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 9.5 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 27th August, 1914.

	PAGES
Papers presented	916
Question: Suspension of Acts	916
Bills: Plant Diseases, 1A.	917
Electoral Act Amendment, 3E.	917
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, Com.	917
Motion: Police Magistrates' retirement ..	919

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Amendment of the Supreme Court Rules. 2, Regulations under the Electoral Act, 1907.

QUESTION—SUSPENSION OF ACTS.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. J. E. Dodd) without notice: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to temporarily suspend the operation of the Industrial Arbitration Act with a view of enabling existing awards to be suspended; and (2) are the Government considering the advisability of also suspending temporarily the operation of "The Truck Act."