

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Seaddan) moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, 9th October, at 4.30 p.m.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 9th October, 1913.

	PAGE
Petition: University Lands Bill	1592
Paper presented	1592
Motion: Electoral Rolls, Legislative Council ..	1592
Bills: Fremantle Improvement, 2R.	1596
Friendly Societies Act Amendment, returned	1600
Supply (No. 2), £1,025,000, all stages ..	1600

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

PETITION—UNIVERSITY LANDS BILL.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL presented a petition signed by the Warden of the Convocation of the University of Western Australia praying the House to refuse its sanction to the transfer of the endowment lands at West Subiaco to the Government in exchange for lands at Crawley.

Petition received, read and ordered to be taken into consideration on the second reading of the University Lands Bill.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Order in Council authorising the manufacture, importation and sale of the explosive "Sabulite."

MOTION—ELECTORAL ROLLS, LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Debate resumed from the 2nd October on the amended motion of the Hon. H. P. Colebatch:—"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that instructions be given to the Chief Electoral Officer that in compiling new rolls for the Legislative Council provinces the names of all persons who are shown by the municipal or roads board lists to possess the necessary qualification, be placed on the new rolls."

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): In rising to support the motion moved by Mr. Colebatch in connection with the Legislative Council rolls, I desire to refer to a matter which has arisen almost annually, and on several occasions just prior to an election being held. We have once or twice been thrust into the somewhat dangerous position of the rolls being swept aside and new rolls, almost at a moment's notice, substituted. It seems almost necessary for the House to keep a watchful eye on the methods adopted by the Electoral Department. I, in common with many others, received a circular and was surprised on reading it to find that many of us were about to be faced with the position of having our names taken off the roll. One hardly realises that that could happen after the statement which was made to the House by the Minister, and it is difficult to understand that the Chief Electoral Officer should send out such a circular without intending to carry out what was stated in it. There is no doubt whatever as to what the circular claimed, and it certainly was the means of making a number of those who seriously considered it, sign claim cards and return them to the department. When I was returning my card I made a special point of asking the Chief Electoral Officer to send me a receipt for the claim I was sending in, because it was the third claim card that I had filled in for the same purpose within four years.

Hon. W. Patrick: For the same property?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Exactly the same property. I have for a considerable time been a taxpayer to the local roads board and the State Taxation De-

partment, as well as to a slight extent to the Federal Taxation Department, and I suppose there are many others in our midst like myself whose qualifications could be turned up at a moment's notice by the Electoral Department. In my case there were many ready opportunities for the Chief Electoral Officer to satisfy himself whether I still retained my qualifications, and there are many who are in a similar position, and it would have been surprising to learn that the department were not going to act upon the wording of that circular which they issued to so many of the electors. Unless we pass this motion as a direct instruction to the Electoral Department it seems to me we will have this kind of thing continually occurring. As I have already stated I have sent in various cards which have frequently been thrust upon me just on the eve of an election, and this has happened not only in connection with the Legislative Council rolls but also in connection with the rolls for the election of members of the Assembly. We have found that in the last alteration made to the Electoral Act power was given to the department to strike out the names from time to time where the department considered that the qualification did not exist, and it has occurred in a good many instances that people have gone to a polling booth to record a vote only to find that a red line had been drawn through their names and that the returning officer had absolutely no power to rectify the error which had evidently been made. I know of instances where people have looked at the roll seven days before an election and seen their names definitely on it. These people knew that they had the right to vote, but on the day of election they found a red line through their names, and definite instructions issued to the returning officer that they were not entitled to vote. Without any notification, or any reason, these people had their names removed and no redress was offered them. It seems to me very necessary that we should pass this motion, and I think there should be some provision made in regard to names which

have been struck out in the manner I have related, such as allowing some latitude to the returning officer to accept the vote of those people who have found themselves in this predicament. After the last Federal elections there were many letters in the newspapers referring to mistakes of this nature which had occurred, and I think there should be some means whereby the people so affected should have the opportunity of exercising the right to vote which has been taken from them, perhaps through some error on the part of persons who have been deputed to go through the rolls. As has been remarked by one or two members who have spoken to this motion it is not perhaps so serious a matter to those who live near the City, and who can apply direct to the Electoral Department to have their names reinserted, or who can put in their claims and qualifications without delay, but it becomes a very difficult matter for the people in the country districts, comprising the larger electorates. I suppose most members of this Chamber realise the difficulties men have on the land. They do not all keep an office in the same manner as city people do, and they have not always a place in which to fix up their business, and keep their papers, pens and ink, and a cause of great worry to them is the making up of the various returns required by the Government from time to time. Statistical returns are a bugbear to a good many of them. When they see the forms which have to be filled in, particularly the form for enrolment for the Legislative Council, which they can only sign before a witness who must also be an elector, they are obliged to put off the signing from day to day and week to week because they have not the conveniences, and when they do happen to come into contact with a person who is an elector, and who can witness their signature, they have either mislaid the claim card or left it in some out of the way place where they cannot get it. The returning of the cards is very often deferred in this way, or, having been on the roll so long, they take a chance, and then only on election

day find that their names have been struck off. However, I am very pleased to hear from the Minister that the action indicated by the circular from the department is not to be taken. I think that is in a large measure due to the fact that Mr. Colebatch brought the matter so prominently before this Chamber. The thanks of members are due to the hon. member for his action, and we all endorse the remarks he made. I hope this discussion will be the means of that department looking more carefully into the clauses of the Act, and realising that the manner in which they were acting was somewhat more drastic than the law permitted. When I personally put my card in I asked that the department should send me a receipt, but up to the present I have not received one. It seems to me almost necessary that when people are sending in a claim card they should get an acknowledgment that their claim has been received, and it should be an instruction to every elector to safeguard that receipt.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is not provided for.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: No, but I personally have put in no less than three applications for enrolment during the last couple of years, and I do not know that any one of them has yet reached the office. I think it would be wise for me to go on signing application forms until I do get a receipt, because it is very little use looking up a roll to see if my name is there if it can be struck off only a week before the election. As to whether a better system could be adopted, I personally think that the plan of copying the names from the existing rolls of the roads boards and municipal councils has always worked admirably in the past and has been quite as satisfactory as the claim cards. But there may be some disc that we should all be supplied with, which would obviate the necessity for constantly sending in claim cards which are to be the only proof as to whether we should be enrolled or not. Once a person's name is on the roll I look upon it as a serious matter indeed that his name should be taken off. It is altogether too serious a thing to be lightly

done, and I am very pleased that this power is not to be lightly availed of. I sincerely support the attitude which has been so well adopted by Mr. Colebatch in this Chamber, and I hope that in future we will have this matter placed on a more definite basis.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (in reply): I wish to say one or two words in reply to the remarks of the Colonial Secretary. I agree almost entirely with everything he said, and I agree with everything in the minutes he has read from the Chief Electoral Officer. All I have to say regarding those minutes is that generally speaking, they, like the flowers that bloom in the spring, have nothing whatever to do with the case. The whole point at issue is this: what are the duties of the Chief Electoral Officer in the matter of compiling these rolls, and what is he entitled to require of the people before they can secure enrolment? I will not say that the Electoral Department does not do everything it possibly can, but the point at issue is what does the Electoral Act say that the elector shall be required to do, and moreover what does the Act say that the department itself must do? My contention is that the Act says clearly that the department must place on the roll every person who appears to be qualified. During last session, in consequence of the fact that in the previous election I found that many hundreds, I might almost say thousands, of people who should have been on the electoral rolls for the East Province, were not on, although they were roads board ratepayers in the majority of cases, I asked a question in this Chamber. Those people did not make application to be placed on the Legislative Council rolls, but had been on the ratepayers' rolls for the roads board for some years, and expected that they would have been automatically transferred to the Legislative Council rolls as had been the practice in the past. On the 17th July I asked the Colonial Secretary—

Is it the intention of the Government to instruct the Chief Electoral Officer to enrol on the Legislative Council rolls of the respective Provinces the names of all persons whose names appear on the electoral lists of any municipality or

roads board district, in respect of property within such province of the annual rateable value of not less than £17, as provided by Subsections (5) and (6) of Section 15 of "The Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1899"? If not, why not?

And the reply of the Colonial Secretary was—

No instruction is necessary, because all persons having a ratepayer's qualification, as prescribed by Section 15 of "The Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1899" (as amended by Act No. 31 of 1911), are enrolled on sending a claim to the registrar in accordance with Section 42 of "The Electoral Act, 1907." They are enrolled on sending in a claim. My contention is that the Act says they should be enrolled without sending in a claim, because Section 40 provides "in preparing new rolls the names of persons who appear to be qualified shall be inserted." There is nothing about names being transferred from the old rolls to the new rolls.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Which Act is that?

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The latest Electoral Act. How can it be contended that a person who possesses the qualifications set out in the Constitution does not appear to be qualified? The Colonial Secretary has stated—I think he read it from matter supplied by the Chief Electoral Officer—that the ratepayers' roll is not a satisfactory document to go upon, but I want to point out that the ratepayers' roll according to the Constitution, is a complete and unquestionable qualification. If a man's name is on the ratepayers' roll for the required amount, he is entitled to have his name placed on the Legislative Council roll.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Because he has the necessary qualifications.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Yes. It is a complete qualification in itself, and therefore his name should be placed upon the new Legislative Council roll, whether he is on the existing Legislative Council roll or not. I received one of these claim cards and a circular from the Chief Electoral Officer, which said "I am unable, therefore, to satisfy myself as to whether

or not you are eligible for transfer to the new rolls." That was an intimation sent to me, and I suppose to a dozen other members in this Chamber. I say that if the Chief Electoral Officer had any respect for the Constitution and the Electoral Act he could easily satisfy himself as to whether we are eligible, and now he tells us he is not going to strike us off, and if we do not return the claim cards he will proceed to satisfy himself as to whether or not we are qualified. He has already said that he is unable to satisfy himself as to whether or not we are qualified, but if we do not return the claim cards he will proceed to satisfy himself. I have brought forward this motion for the reason, that when the last rolls were compiled the electoral lists for the municipalities and the roads boards were entirely, and I say improperly, ignored. Now, when I received this notice "I am unable therefore to satisfy myself as to whether or not you are eligible for transfer to the new roll," what conclusion would I come to except that the electoral lists for the municipalities and roads boards were to be entirely ignored again? To my mind it was a mistake that the old revision courts were done away with. They were composed of people resident in the district, the whole of the justices in each district, I believe.

Hon. J. Cornell: And some of them were one-eyed.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The only thing that could happen before those courts was that the electoral officer appeared and applied to have a man's name struck off or put on the roll. The chances are that the members of the bench had personal knowledge as to whether people were entitled to go on the roll or not, and if they had not personal knowledge they obtained evidence in court and on that decided the matter.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It prevented a lot of roll-stuffing, too.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Of course it did, but now people are enrolled and struck off at the sweet will of the Electoral Department. As I said before, I know hundreds of people have been struck off the rolls improperly, and a large number have been put on who ought not to

have been put on. I do not say for a moment that these ratepayers' lists should be the only means of finding out whether a person is qualified or not, but they should be the chief means. We get on these ratepayers' lists almost everybody who is qualified to vote for the Legislative Council.

Member: And the taxation returns.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The Constitution does not say anything about the taxation returns, but it does direct the returning officer to regard the municipal and roads board qualifications. It seems reasonable to me that he should require a claim for all new names that do not appear on either of these lists, but if they do I say it is the bounden duty of the electoral officer to place them on the new rolls. For this reason I hope this motion, as amended by the Hon. Mr. Cullen, will be carried and that in the future we shall not have these notices sent out when nothing is intended to be done with them, but that they shall be sent only to persons who do not appear to be qualified, and that every person who appears to be qualified shall have his name placed on the roll as directed by Section 40 of the Electoral Act.

Question, as amended, put and passed.

BILL—FREMANTLE IMPROVEMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: This short Bill is of great importance to the people of Fremantle and is designed to remove a source of considerable danger to pedestrians by the congestion of traffic in certain parts of that port. As hon. members know, the streets of Fremantle are none too wide, and when into these streets, already sufficiently narrow, tram lines are introduced, a congestion of the traffic and consequent danger to pedestrians very frequently occur. Under this Bill, subject to the necessary precautionary conditions which I shall enumerate later on, the municipality is authorised to arrange for the resumption

of the land on the west side of High-street from Market-street to the town hall.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: You mean the north side; the street runs east and west.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The local authority at Fremantle has had the question of widening High-street under consideration for some time. It is, as hon. members know, the principal thoroughfare, but it is not proposed in this Bill to deal with the whole length of the street, but merely that section between the town hall and Market-street, Market-street being the thoroughfare which leads to the railway station, while High-street is the principal business street of the port. The tramway service down High-street passes by way of Market-street to the railway station and in all three lines of tramway converge at the intersection. The schedule to the Bill shows the area proposed to be resumed and also the scheme of widening High-street and Market-street. This would not only provide for more room in these streets, but also remove an ugly corner, the danger of which is considerably increased by a telegraph pole, the space between the curb and the tram line being only about two feet. Under the Municipalities Act, 1906, there is power for the local authority by means of the Public Works Act, 1902, to resume any land required for the purpose of widening a street, but if that course were pursued it would mean that the buildings fronting this main thoroughfare would have to be demolished at enormous cost. The local authorities have come to the conclusion that it would be preferable to resume the whole area, because if only a portion of it were resumed the cost would not be very much less than if the whole were resumed. It is proposed that on a day to be fixed after the passing of this Bill, if it is passed, a proclamation shall issue vesting this land shown in the schedule in the municipality of Fremantle. Provision is made in the measure for the assessment of the value of the land and the amount of compensation to be paid under the Public Works Act, 1902. The land is to be assessed as from the 9th September, 1913, the date on which notice was

given of the intended introduction of this Bill. The reason for this will be realised by hon. members: it is to prevent the possibility of dummaging or trafficking in the land. The Bill, however, provides that interest at the rate of six per cent. shall be paid to those owning the rights to the land as from the date of issue of the proclamation, and an important proviso is that no proclamation may issue if the ratepayers disapprove of the proposal. Within a month of the passing of the Bill any 20 ratepayers may demand a poll as to whether the proposed acquisition of this land by the municipality meets with the approval of the majority of the ratepayers.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: It is a referendum by the ratepayers on the Bill as a whole?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Practically that. The money to be paid for the land as compensation is to be raised by a loan under the Municipalities Act, 1906, but for obvious reasons no limit is placed on the amount which can be borrowed, because it is almost impossible to say at this stage how much will be required. It is further provided that before any loan is raised under the Bill the consent of the Minister controlling municipalities must first be obtained. That is a safeguard which I think will be appreciated by property owners in the municipality. In connection with the poll of ratepayers, which, as I remarked before, may be demanded by 20 ratepayers, the procedure will be somewhat different from the ordinary ratepayers' poll on a loan proposition. That is to say, besides a poll of those opposed to the proposition, the votes of those favourable to it would also be taken, and the decision shall be on the majority of votes cast.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Whose votes are taken?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The votes of ratepayers as defined in this Bill.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Owners and occupiers?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Owners and occupiers in this case and every ratepayer, whether he has paid his rates

or not, will be entitled to vote. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): I have very much pleasure in supporting the Bill. One cannot help being struck with the want of foresight exercised by persons in times gone by, that a place which has reached the importance that Fremantle has, and which is destined to become much more important in the future, should have been laid out so badly. I believe that in times gone by the main thoroughfare of the town, High-street, was much wider than it is to-day, and that in the Crown Colony days a request was made by persons owning land abutting on that street, and they were permitted to encroach upon the street. It is quite obvious to persons who live at Fremantle, or who frequent that town, that High-street is not wide enough for the traffic of the day, and, as the State progresses, and Fremantle progresses with it, the inconvenience of that narrow thoroughfare will continue to be felt. I have no hesitation in saying that those two corners, the corner of Market-street and High-street, and the corner of Adelaide-street and High-street, at the present time are two death traps. As the Colonial Secretary remarked, there are three lines of tramways converging and, consequent upon the narrowness of High-street, the whole of the traffic to the railway station, which is a terminus, has to be carried on a single line, and trams are frequently held up to enable a tram to go along High-street before an incoming car can reach the terminus. Such a condition of affairs makes the system a toy system and subjects the public to inconvenience. Market-street corner is particularly a death trap, as one of the tram lines there is, I think, within two feet of a telegraph pole, and abuts right up against the footpath. This is a part of Fremantle where an experiment of this kind can be carried out at a minimum of cost. The whole of the buildings from Market-street to Adelaide-street are old ramshackle buildings and it would be quite useless to bring forward a proposal of this kind after good buildings had been

erected upon the land from Market-street to Adelaide-street. It is proposed by this Bill to submit the question to the rate-payers, but that, in my opinion, is a great blot upon the measure, as if, unfortunately, the people of Fremantle were to reject the proposal under the fear that it might impose a little additional rating upon them, I think a great wrong would be done to the people who will live in that town in the future. I think this is a power which should be exercised whether the people like it or not, as it would be a great benefit to that town for all time to come. However, the Government have inserted in the Bill power to enable the people to express their opinion on the question and I make no further complaint than this, and if, unfortunately, the people were so short-sighted as to reject the proposal, I think the matter so important and pressing in the interests of the community that the Government should introduce another measure next session and have the alteration made, whether the people like it or not. It has been argued that it is not necessary to take the whole of the land shown in the schedule, but with that argument I do not agree for one moment. I think this is the very smallest quantity of land that could be taken under this proposal. It was stated in another place that this scheme could be carried out by eliminating block 328 from the proposal, but it is quite necessary that that should be included in the scheme for this reason: It may be necessary, after the land is resumed, to run an arcade or another thoroughfare from Cantonment-street to Adelaide-street, and block 328 is taken with that object. It is not a new thing to take an area of land, such as is proposed here, when it is intended to widen a street. In Sydney these resumptions have taken place in wholesale fashion, and hon. members who know anything about London are aware that very large areas of land have there been taken for street widening, with the result that portions of the resumptions left over have almost recouped the local authorities for their expenditure. In all probability this will be found to obtain in the present case also. The Bill provides that the etched

part of the plan shown on the schedule should be utilised for the purpose of increasing the width of High-street. In my opinion that area in itself is not sufficient. Market-street and High-street should both be widened to a greater extent than the 12 feet proposed, but I am glad to see that the Bill contains a proviso enabling this width to be increased if the Governor-in-Council thinks fit. Full compensation is to be given to the owners of the property, and the date is fixed at which the valuation of the property shall be taken. That is quite necessary to prevent any trafficking in land, and to save the municipality from the possibility of being called upon to pay any more than the actual value of the land. It is my intention to move an additional clause in connection with this compensation, a clause which I do not think the Government will refuse to accept. It is somewhat on the lines of a provision in the Public Works Act Amendment Bill which was rejected in this House two years ago. The proposed clause will provide that the amount of compensation shall not exceed the amount set down upon the land tax assessment. It was pointed out in that instance that the provision was likely to be unjust, in that it was made to apply to cases in which only a portion of a person's land was taken. If the whole of the land belonged to the registered proprietor no injustice would have been done by providing that the maximum amount of compensation to be awarded should not exceed the amount the owner himself had shown as the value of the land for taxation purposes. Under such a provision if any owners have been unduly inflating the value of their property it does not follow that they will get that amount. If, on the other hand, they have been putting in returns unduly below the actual value they should have paid taxes upon, then they will only have themselves to blame. Owners declare in the land tax returns that the value there set out is the fair and full value of the land, and I claim that the value thus put upon the land is a fair basis for determining the compensation.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Allowing nothing for disturbance?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Yes, allowing ten per cent. for disturbance, as provided in existing legislation. When a man sends in a land tax return, he has to show the value of the improvements, the unimproved value of the land, and the total value of the land unimproved and with improvements, and it is a penal offence for a man to wilfully put in a false return. I have already said that such a provision for limiting the amount of compensation is open to the contention that it is unfair if only part of the land is taken; but if all the land is taken, then nobody can complain. I opposed the Government on the Public Works Act Amendment Bill in respect to this provision because it was crude and provided that portions of the land could be taken. That was the injustice of it; but I think we may apply the principle with the utmost fairness to the proposal before the House, and I shall take the sense of the Committee on the question.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Not retrospectively.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I hardly know what the hon. member means by retrospectively. The Bill fixes the value of the land as on the 9th September of this year. Therefore, as returns which have been put in in 1913 by any owner of land declare his land to be of a particular value, that ought to be the utmost compensation which that owner is entitled to get. No hardship will be inflicted on any person if he is taken at his own valuation. If any persons have put in returns embodying gross undervaluations, and they are not putting—

The PRESIDENT: Is the hon. member confining himself to the Bill?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I think so.

The PRESIDENT: I thought the hon. member was talking about matters yet to come into the Bill.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Yes, I wish the compensation to be limited to the value put on the land for taxation purposes. I am going to take the sense of the Committee on that question, and I will dis-

cuss it more fully then. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East): There is just one point which I require to be satisfied about. Is there any special reason to justify us in going outside the principle laid down in the Municipalities Act when ratepayers are asked to commit themselves to a large loan on which they will have to find interest and sinking fund? It is proposed to do away with a number of sections in the Municipalities Act, but to retain Section 450, under which it will be an obligation on the council, having borrowed the money, to strike a rate sufficient to pay interest and sinking fund. The sections which it is proposed to do away with are those which permit people on whom the burden is to fall to demand a poll. I do not think it could be contended that in the past our municipalities have gone too slowly in the matter of borrowing money. I do not think that contention can be set up in any district of Western Australia. It may be contended that in some instances the owners have been willing to allow the municipalities to go too fast, but it cannot be said that the municipalities have gone too slow in the matter of borrowing money because the property owners have protested. Under the Bill we are going to take the decision out of the hands of the people on whom the burden ultimately falls. I shall require to be satisfied that there is some special reason for departing from the hitherto approved principle. If it is a good thing to take it out of the hands of the property owners in regard to this particular case, should we not amend the Municipalities Act and take it out of the hands of the property owners altogether?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Certainly not.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The second point is this: are there special circumstances in this case which justify us in taking one man one vote as a basis for deciding municipal matters? It would appear that those responsible for the Bill think it should be one man one vote under the Municipalities Act, and not only one ratepayer but one adult. Is

this the thin end of the wedge? Are we to pass the Bill and be told later on, "In regard to this very important matter you agreed to the principle of one ratepayer one vote in municipal affairs; how can you consistently oppose it now in all municipal affairs?" I would support the clause if I could be shown why we should take a different course from the one we have always followed in the past. On the face of it there does not appear to me to be any reason why the ratepayer, as distinct from the property owner, should vote on this issue, and why on all other issues regarding municipal borrowings the property owner alone is allowed to vote. Nor is there any reason why on this question it should be one ratepayer one vote and one only, whereas on all other municipal questions the ratepayers have votes according to their property qualifications. What is the reason for this? Why is it proposed that not only rate-payers, but rate-owners also, should have the vote? I am opposed to giving the vote to people who owe rates. I do not presume to know anything about the question as dealt with by Mr. Moss; I have no special knowledge of Fremantle, but this Bill strikes me as a violent disturbance of principles obtaining in our Municipalities Act. In regard to municipal ratepayers, we have said when it comes to a matter of borrowing money the interest and sinking fund of which will fall on the property, that the property owner is the man who has the vote, that, as the hon. Mr. Davis has said, "the man who pays the piper should call the tune." That is the idea we have followed in all our municipal legislation. Are there special reasons why it should be departed from in this case? Also, I would ask, are there any special reasons for introducing the one man one vote principle, and the further principle that rate-owners as well as ratepayers should vote? These are the only points in the Bill on which I shall ask the Colonial Secretary for information before I am prepared to support it as it stands.

On motion by Hon. D. G. Gawler debate adjourned.

BILL—FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Legislative Assembly without amendment.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £1,025,000.

All Stages.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read the first time.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the resolutions from Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Question passed.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew), in moving the second reading, said: This is the usual Supply Bill to supply out of Consolidated Revenue £525,000 and from Loan Fund £500,000 for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1914. The moneys are required to enable the work of administration to be carried on. We were under the impression that it would not be necessary to seek supplies in this form. It was anticipated that the Estimates would have been down long before this, but I have an assurance from the Treasurer that the Budget will be introduced on Thursday next. In the meantime supply is necessary. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee. etc.

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

Read a third time, and passed.

House adjourned at 5.33 p.m.