act alone if the other auditor were not elected. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

No. 31—agreed to.

No. 32—Clause 187: After the word "fence," in line one, insert the words "erected by the board":

THE PREMIER: This clause provided that any person neglecting to keep in repair a fence or a gate separating his land from a road should be guilty of an offence. The amendment limited the offence to neglecting to keep in repair a fence erected by the board. The reasons for the obligation applied whether the fence was erected by the board or by the individual, the object being to protect the road. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, and the amendment not agreed to.

No. 33—Clause 188, after the word "gate" insert the words "which has been":

THE PREMIER: The intention apparently was to apply this penalty clause only to gates which had already, in the past, been placed across roads by boards.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

Nos. 34, 35—agreed to.

No. 36—Schedule 14, strike out the words "For man in possession, each day or part of day, five shillings," and insert "For man in possession one shilling an hour for the first three hours, and if longer detained eight shillings a day or part of a day" in lieu thereof:

THE PREMIER: The amount of five shillings was undoubtedly too low: a man's services could not be obtained for it, and thus loss was necessarily occasioned to roads boards. The Council's amendment was reasonable.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

No. 37—Schedule 17, strike out the words "Nelson" and "South Perth," and insert the words "Belmont," "Bunbury Suburban," and "Cannington":

THE PREMIER: Schedule 17 set forth road board districts which were empowered to borrow. By some oversight, Nelson and South Perth had been included: they were now struck out. Belmont, Bunbury Suburban, and Cannington were inserted.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10 minutes to 10 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 16th December, 1902.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, Coal Mines Regulations Act, 1902—Amendment of Part I. of the regulations thereunder. 2, Western Australian Government Railways—Alteration to Classification and Rate Book. 3, Report of the Government Astronomer for the year 1901.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced, by leave without notice, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, and read a first time.

RABBIT PEST BILL.

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

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The Council having amended the Bill, and the Assembly having agreed to seven amendments and disagreed to three, the latter were now farther considered, in Committee.

On motions by MINISTER FOR LANDS, the Council's amendments Nos. 2 and 3 were not insisted on.

No. 7—New Clause (to prohibit street sale of newspapers on Sundays, between 11 and 1 o'clock midday):

HON. G. RANDELL, as mover of the new clause, said he would not ask the Council to insist on it, seeing that certain other amendments had not been insisted on. From inquiries made, he gathered that in no part of the world was the crying of newspapers allowed on Sunday. The logical position was that if we allowed the selling of newspapers by call or in any way on Sundays, we practically said that the shops of the city might be opened. We found that certain persons who were anxious to limit the hours of labour were opposed to this amendment for reasons one could not understand. It seemed exceedingly inconsistent on their part to encourage and permit the sale of papers on Sundays. He was sure the good sense of the community would sooner or later put down this crying evil which prevailed in our city. He moved that the Council's amendment be not insisted on.

Question passed, and the amendment not insisted on.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

BREAD BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The Council having made nine amendments in the Bill, and the Assembly having agreed to five and disagreed to four, the latter were now farther considered in Committee.

No. 2—Clause 3, definition of "standard wheaten bread," strike out paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*), and insert the words "without any mixture or division is the whole produce of the grain, the bran or hull thereof only excepted":

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the Council's amendment be not insisted on. The reasons given by the Assembly for disagreeing to the amendment were that the definition proposed by the Assembly was one universally adopted in other Bread Acts, and the amendment proposed would destroy the principal objects of the Bill.

HON. G. RANDELL: At the outset he took exception to the words made use of in the reasons advanced. He had looked up the English Act, the Victorian Act, and the South Australian Act, and the words added here were the exact words of those Acts; showing that those who made use of that expression really did not know what they were talking about. The amendments were inserted because the words were so much more suitable and easily understood. The provision as it stood would be inoperative. Not many people would understand its meaning. As to paragraph (*b*), he had no great objection. The Council should insist on the first amendment so far as it related to paragraph (*a*), in the interest of clearer definition, and because the words occurred in the Acts of other States dealing with bread.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Paragraph (*b*) also was in the Victorian Act.

HON. G. RANDELL: That was in all the Acts.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Paragraph (*a*) was also in the Victorian Act, he believed.

HON. G. RANDELL: No.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: If paragraph (*b*) had not been struck out, the amendment of the hon. member would, he was sure, have been accepted.

HON. G. RANDELL moved that the Council's amendment in paragraph (*a*) be insisted on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Standing Order 296 provided that "The amendments made by the Legislative Assembly shall be then either agreed to with or without amendments, or disagreed to, and the original amendments made by the Council insisted on; or the Bill may be ordered to be laid aside." He thought the question might be put that the Council's amendment be agreed to with the amendment (Mr. Randell's), now proposed.

HON. R. G. BURGES: If the Council's amendment were not passed, people would be able to sell bad flour, although the object of the Bill was to compel people to sell good bread. It was generally understood that a bushel of wheat would make 40lbs. of flour. Good wheat would do so, but some wheat from the other States and also some in this would not.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: The Council's amendment should be adhered to as regarded paragraph (*a*). The language of the clause as it originally stood was open to the construction that the husk of the wheat could be used instead of bran. The result might be that the husk of the wheat would be ground up with the flour. While bran was wholesome and desirable, no one wanted husk mixed with flour. All millers of this State could, with present day rolling appliances, produce 40lbs. of flour to the bushel. Of course, if wheat were not good, the proportion of bran and pollard would be larger and the proportion of flour smaller.

HON. W. MALEY: Paragraph *(a)* having been struck out, paragraph *(b)* was useless.

HON. G. RANDELL: It was proposed to retain paragraph *(a)*.

HON. W. MALEY: Then let paragraph *(b)* be struck out. The provision was antiquated and meaningless, and if we rejected it the onus of its insertion would rest on the Assembly.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The standard fixed in South Australia for this year's crop was 63lbs. to the bushel. But a bushel might not weigh more than 57lbs; therefore the two-thirds provision was absurd and unworkable. How was one to know what was the weight of a bushel of wheat at the time it was grown?

Question passed, and paragraph *(a)* insisted on.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the Council's amendment relating to paragraph *(b)* be not insisted on.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: The paragraph applied to flour in the hands of bakers, ready to be made into bread; and how was it possible to ascertain the nature of the wheat from which the flour had been produced? The provision was ridiculous.

HON. R. G. BURGES: Paragraph (*b*) would spoil the whole Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Mr. Piesse had explained that wheat varied from 57lbs. to 63lbs. per bushel. Naturally, in the circumstances a baker would be allowed the benefit of a doubt, and 57lbs. would be assumed as the standard.

HON. G. RANDELL: The intention in inserting this provision in the English Act was not clear. Victoria and South Australia had adopted the provision apparently with the object of insuring that flour should not be too fine. The average weight of wheat was 60lbs. to the bushel, though he had seen wheat even higher than 63lbs. to the bushel sent from this State to London, in 1851. The object of the provision was to retain in the flour some little "sharps," as the trade term was—the finest of the hull. Wheat dressed with the excellent machinery now in use was deprived of every particle except the actual flour itself. Medical gentlemen, he understood, maintained that flour was not so good and wholesome if all pollard and bran were dressed out of it. He supported the retention of paragraph *(b)*.

Question passed, and paragraph (*b*) not insisted on.

No. 4.—Clause 9, strike out the clause:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the amendment be not insisted on.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: This was fully threshed out before. He hoped members would not go back on the decision.

HON. G. RANDELL: The language employed was ambiguous, and did not effect the object aimed at by the clause.

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

Ayes	...	...	6
Noes	...	...	13
Majority against	...		7

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. R. G. Burges	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. J. A. Thomson	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. R. Laurie (*Teller*).	Hon. W. T. Loton
	Hon. W. Maley
	Hon. E. McLarty
	Hon. C. A. Piesse
	Hon. G. Randell
	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
	Hon. B. C. Wood
	Hon. J. E. Richardson (*Teller*).

Question thus negatived, and the amendment insisted on.

No. 6—Clause 15, after the word "customer," line 1, insert "on the premises of any seller of bread":

Council's amendment insisted on, on motion by HON. A. G. JENKINS.

No. 7—Clause 16, strike out the word "seven," line 2, and insert "five":

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the Council's amendment be not insisted on.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: This amendment was moved to enable employees to start work at five o'clock on Sundays, instead of seven. It was passed without a division, so he hoped the Committee would not stultify itself.

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

Ayes	...	...	6
Noes	...	...	13
Majority against		...	7

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. R. G. Burges
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. G. Randell	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. A. Thomson	Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. E. McLarty (*Teller*).	Hon. R. Laurie
	Hon. W. T. Loton
	Hon. W. Maley
	Hon. C. A. Piesse
	Hon. J. E. Richardson
	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
	Hon. B. C. Wood
	Hon. A. G. Jenkins (*Teller*).

Question thus negatived, and the amendment insisted on.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee, consisting of Hon. J. D. Connolly, Hon. G. Randell, and Hon. A. G. Jenkins, drew up reasons for insisting on certain amendments, as follow:—

No. 2.—The words used by the Legislative Council in its amendment are the exact words used in the Statutes of the United Kingdom, Victoria, and South Australia. Far from destroying the objects of the Bill, the amendment made by the Legislative Council more clearly defines the intentions of the Bill.

No. 4.—The clause as passed by the Legislative Assembly is so vague and indefinite as to be practically unworkable, and is not in harmony with the wording of similar clauses in Bread Bills referred to above.

No. 6.—Consequential on No. 4.

No. 7.—It is considered that the later hour would seriously interfere with the baker's business. It is believed that the earlier hour is desired both by employers and employees.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

COOLGARDIE GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

PERTH TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

MOUNT BAY ROAD SECTION.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill is simply to amend Section 179 of the Health Act. That section provides that "notwithstanding the last preceding section" (enabling a local board to levy a rate of sixpence in the £), "a local board may provide for the proper disposal of nightsoil or other refuse, whether within the district or not, by making an annual charge, payable in advance, for the removal of the nightsoil or other refuse in respect of each and every place from whence the receptacles for nightsoil have to be removed." It is found that in a number of small municipalities where this pan rate is being charged at present, it acts with some severity on poor people who are bound to pay the whole sum in advance, amounting to 30s. or £2, payable annually. To get over that, it is proposed to insert after "advance" the words "or by equal monthly or other instalments in advance." It enables the pan rate to be made payable by monthly payments or quarterly payments as the board may think fit. It is a small amendment, but important. It will relieve poor people from paying the pan rate in one sum. I move the second reading.

HON. W. T. LOTON (East): I am in favour of the principle, but it seems to

me that if you have monthly payments it will entail great expenditure in collecting small sums. If the House limits the payments to quarterly payments, that will be liberal enough. If the amount be paid quarterly, generally a month or half a quarter will pass by before the sum is collected.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE, ETC.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of 62 Vict., No. 24, S. 179:

HON. W. T. LOTON: Quarterly payments would in his opinion be quite liberal enough. As already pointed out, the system would entail a great amount of clerical work in keeping these accounts. In many instances the charge would not be more than about £1 a year.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: It would be optional with the local bodies.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Local bodies put a most liberal construction on a thing of this sort.

Clause passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS INQUIRY.

TO ADOPT REPORT.

Report of the Select Committee now considered.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South): In presenting the report of the select committee appointed by the House to look into the Metropolitan Waterworks, he was glad they had found some reason for the suspicions that were abroad that the Metropolitan Waterworks were not conducted in a businesslike and proper manner. More especially was he pleased because he thought that at the outset he had not the sympathy of some members of the House in asking for the inquiry. There was ample evidence that some reform was required in the management of that very important department.

HON. R. G. BURGES: Where was the evidence?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The evidence had, he understood, been given to each member. He could not help referring to Mr. Traylen, who was the chairman of directors of that board. He did not think the Government had been wise in making the appointment of chairman. The chairman seemed to have very little knowledge of the varied departments under him, and in no way did he seem to carry on the business in a businesslike manner. Evidence was before the Committee showing he had acted in a most arbitrary manner. In some cases he had acted in a way not befitting the chairman of a public institution like that, and he had gone quite beyond the actions of an ordinary business man or of a Government official. The Committee had examined the following witnesses:—Mr. Traylen, Mr. Newman, Mr. Percy F. Traylen, Mr. Faulkner, Mr. Frank Craig, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Ralph Donkin, Dr. Haynes, Mr. Hall, Mr. Barker, Mr. Hawtin, Mr. Smyth, and the Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Palmer).

MEMBER: Who was Mr. Donkin?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: An engineer of some considerable experience in waterworks.

THE PRESIDENT: The evidence taken by the committee was not in the possession of members.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: As the evidence had not been handed to members, it would be better for him to adjourn the debate till to-morrow, with the permission of the President and members of the House.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must finish his speech, and then any other member could move that the debate be adjourned until the evidence was before the House.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: In regard to the highest officer of the board, Mr. Traylen, it had to be said ——

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member had not carried out the provisions of Standing Order 332, which read:—

> If any measure or proceeding be necessary upon a report of a select committee, such measure or proceeding shall be brought under the consideration of the Council by a specific motion, of which notice must be given in the usual manner.

The only motion before the House was one for consideration of the select committee's report.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE said he would conclude with a motion that the report be adopted. Having inquired of the Clerk, he understood that he was taking the proper course.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must give notice of what he intended to do in connection with the report. The speech ought to have commenced with a motion.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE said he intended to move that the report be adopted.

THE PRESIDENT: In this particular case, the House might allow the hon. member to deliver his speech, concluding with a motion that the report be adopted. Of course debate could not proceed until such time as members generally were placed in possession of the evidence.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The fact that the evidence was not before members was a disadvantage to himself also.

HON. W. T. LOTON rose to a point of order. The fact of the report having been laid on the table of the House did not warrant the hon. member in addressing the House on the subject. The hon. member must give notice of motion.

MEMBER: Discussion of the report was an order of the day.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Having had some experience of another place, he was in a position to say that to deal with a report in this manner was not usual. Notice of motion ought to be given, so that members might know what was proposed to be done.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member (Mr. Brimage) might conclude his speech, and then move that the report be adopted. The debate thereupon could be adjourned until the evidence was placed before members.

HON. F. T. O. BRIMAGE said he now moved the adoption of the select committee's report, and he based that motion on the grounds he had stated. There was evidence that the Metropolitan Waterworks Board was not properly managed. The evidence showed that Mr. Traylen had not studied the public interests, that he had employed his own relatives to the detriment of the board——

MEMBER: How many of his own relatives?

HON. F. T. O. BRIMAGE: Two sons. Mr. Traylen's assistant, Mr. Newman, had evidently altogether forgotten that he was a public servant: his letters bordered on insolence. Mr. Hargrave, in whom the board had a good director, had admitted, on being shown certain letters written by Mr. Newman, that they were not courteous in tone, and certainly not such as should be written by the secretary of the board to the public. One could not say much about Mr. Frank Craig, except that he had not had previous waterworks experience. Of course, as a business man, Mr. Craig was held in the highest esteem, and he had done his work in a manner which was fairly satisfactory. Mr. Traylen, however, seemed to override his co-directors. The late Mr. Alexander Forrest had attended one meeting of the board, and had left it disgusted at the manner in which Mr. Traylen conducted the business of the board and the proceedings generally. Members of the select committee, having visited the reservoir, recommended the establishment of a septic tank at the Canning, so that as much as possible of the matter held in suspension might be caught and the necessity for expensive methods of filtration in Perth in a great measure avoided. The board's cost of pumping seemed out of all proportion. In connection with the Government water supply at Fremantle, the cost was $1\frac{2}{3}$d. per thousand gallons, whilst here in Perth it was $5\frac{1}{4}$d. per thousand gallons. Why should this discrepancy exist?

HON. G. RANDELL: The select committee ought to have found that out.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: If the cause had been discovered, it was that the methods of the board were altogether too expensive for the size of its business.

HON. M. L. MOSS: In connection with the Fremantle water supply, prison labour was employed.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The Engineer-in-Chief had stated in evidence that he saw no reason why the pumping should not be done as cheaply in Perth as in Fremantle, and from other professional evidence the select committee thought that there was no reason for the excessive cost of pumping by the board. Undoubtedly, the present methods of supplying Perth with water were altogether too expensive. With proper methods and under good management, Perth ought to be supplied with water

for less than 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons.

HON. R. G. BURGES: Did the report show how that estimate was arrived at?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Perhaps the hon. member would lend a hand in framing an estimate. The evidence left no doubt that Mr. Traylen had sought to manage the superintendent, Mr. Faulkner. If that officer had been given his own way, the water supplied to Perth would have been much better in quality. True, in the centre of the city and in various suburbs the water was now fairly clear; but in other quarters it was unfit for domestic use. There was no question that Mr. Faulkner had been prevented by Mr. Traylen from doing good work. The report recommended that a thoroughly competent engineer should be appointed to take charge of the works. With a man of that calibre as chairman, and representatives of the ratepayers to assist him, much of the prevailing dissatisfaction might be removed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The whole trouble was how to form a constituency.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The procedure indicated would undoubtedly be wise. Unquestionably, much discontent prevailed at present; lack of time alone had prevented the committee from accepting much evidence tendered as to the treatment meted out by Mr. Traylen to the public. That gentleman had in several cases given orders to cut water off hospitals because rates remained unpaid. To cut off water was dangerous in any case. If fire broke out in a large building from which water was cut off, all Perth might be burnt down.

MEMBER: In cases of fire, water was obtained from the street main.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Still, sometimes water was wanted inside the building as well. Since members had not the evidence before them, and since he believed that as mover he had a right to reply, he would defer farther observations.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How far would the motion carry us? Would the adoption of the report commit the House to the report?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes; it would.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In that case, Mr. Loton's point of order was very properly taken.

THE PRESIDENT: From the procedure adopted in similar cases which had occurred in the past, it appeared that this matter was in order. The House had ordered the report to be considered to-day.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If the mover intended to conclude with a motion that the report be adopted, notice of that motion ought to have been given.

THE PRESIDENT: The motion had not yet been seconded.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: For the sake of discussion, he formally seconded the motion.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, debate adjourned until the next Tuesday.

ELECTORAL BILL.

SECOND READING MOVED.

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister), in moving the second reading, said: I do not propose to address the House at any very great length in introducing this Bill, because to a large extent it is a measure which more properly can be discussed when we get into Committee; but the Bill, as hon. members will see from the first schedule, proposes to repeal certain sections of the Constitution Act and to alter the Electoral Act of 1899. All the various clauses relating to the franchise of voters for the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council should be more properly in a Constitution Bill; and seeing the action taken by this Chamber on the Constitution Bill, it follows that all those provisions contained in Clause 14 and subsequent clauses will at once be negatived by this House, and I shall certainly not ask the House to consider those. This Bill, so far as regards the qualification of electors to vote in Parliament, provides in Clause 19 that "no person may, at the same time, be registered on more than one Council roll, or on more than one Assembly roll." I point that out at once because it embodies the principle of one adult one vote, and it is a matter that this House no doubt will be prepared to debate when we get into Committee. One of the main alterations in this Bill from the present law is this. Clause 15 provides that any person is, from the moment his name is on the roll, entitled to vote. Under the present Act a person has to be six months

on the roll, and that has been found to be productive of much inconvenience, because it has necessitated on all these rolls the introduction of a fourth column, containing the date on which a person first obtained his registration; and an election may take place, but it does not follow that all the persons on the roll are entitled to vote, because the returning officer, a candidate, and all those persons hunting round to get that vote must satisfy themselves not only that a person is on the roll, but that he has been on the roll six months. I certainly regard that as very inconvenient, and a great absurdity. I believe that a person once on the roll should be entitled to record his vote. That difficulty is removed, because we provide here that once a person is on the roll he is entitled to exercise his vote. According to Clause 30 of this Bill, the rolls are conclusive evidence "that the persons registered thereon have a right to vote; and the rolls shall not be questioned, except in courts of revision, and as mentioned in section one hundred and twelve." That is the present law. The Bill enables the presiding officer to ask a number of questions: "Are you the person whose name appears on the roll?" "Are you of the full age of twenty-one years?" "Have you already voted, either here or elsewhere at this election?" "Are you disqualified from voting?" All these answers being given satisfactorily, the right of the person on the roll to vote is conclusive. Clause 34 is a new one, and it provides that every elector whose name appears on more than one provincial roll has to elect at once on which provincial roll he will be registered, and in default of his making a choice the inspector of parliamentary rolls will have the right to strike out the name of the elector from every roll except one. That is a farther provision in the direction of one man one vote. All the other clauses in this measure follow in many respects the existing law, until we come to Clause 73. At present in nominating for either House of Parliament it is necessary that the candidate shall sign a nomination paper and be nominated by two persons entitled to vote at the election, the idea being, I suppose, to insure that he is a *bona fide* candidate. It is a very poor candidate who cannot get two persons to sign his nomination paper, but we find elsewhere, I think throughout Australia generally, that this provision has not been embodied in their Electoral Acts, and we propose in this Bill to abolish the necessity of having any name on the nomination paper other than that of the candidate. The Bill follows largely the electoral law of the Commonwealth, and it is up to date with electoral legislation in Australia. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill, and I shall have much pleasure in explaining the clauses in greater detail if members desire.

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

Ayes	...	...	7
Noes	...	...	10
Majority against		...	3

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. W. Maley
Hon. C. Sommers	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. B. C. Wood (*Teller*).	Hon. C. A. Piesse
	Hon. G. Randell
	Hon. J. E. Richardson
	Hon. E. G. Burges (*Teller*).

Second reading thus negatived.

At 6·26, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.
At 7·40, Chair resumed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned until the next day.