

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

*Wednesday, 4th January, 1888.*

New Member—Expenditure of £2,000 on Geraldton Jetty—Fremantle Jetty Extension and Harbor Works—Message (No. 3): The Financial Position and the Estimates for 1888—Revenue and Expenditure Statement for 1887—Esperance Bay to Hampton Plains Railway Proposals—Petition (No. 3): Duty on Beer—Coastal Steam Service: Report of Select Committee—Tariff Bill, 1888: second reading: committal: third reading—Goldfields Act Amendment Bill, 1888—Suspension of Standing Orders—Election of Deputy Speaker—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

## NEW MEMBER.

Mr. GEORGE LEAKE (Crown Solicitor) having handed to Mr. Speaker a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, appointing him to be a non-elective member of the House—*vice* Mr. J. C. H. James, who had resigned—took and subscribed the usual oath of allegiance.

## EXPENDITURE OF £2,000 ON GERALDTON JETTY.

MR. KEANE asked the Director of Public Works what steps had been taken, or were proposed to be taken, with respect to the disbursement of the £2,000 voted out of the 1884 Loan for expenditure on the Geraldton Jetty.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) replied that, as he had on a previous occasion stated, he thought that the question as to how this money could best be expended might very well be postponed to the next meeting of Council.

HARBOR WORKS, FREMANTLE;  
EXTENSION OF JETTY.

## IN COMMITTEE:

MR. SHENTON, in accordance with notice, moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that the sum of £20,000 now to the credit of the Fremantle Harbor Works may be expended in the further extension of the Fremantle jetty, and that the work may be commenced at once. The hon. member said that the recent extension of the jetty had largely increased the facilities afforded to the

shipping, and there could be no doubt that if the sum which he now proposed should be expended upon that structure were spent upon it, it would be a still greater boon. Each addition to the jetty meant an immediately remunerative expenditure, besides being a great source of convenience to vessels visiting the port. Hon. members were aware of the disadvantages and delays to which ships laying in Gage's Roads at present labored under, especially during the winter months, in consequence of their not being able to come alongside the jetty, because it did not run out into deep enough water. The expenditure of this £20,000 upon the present structure would take it to from 19 to 20 feet at low water. This would enable vessels, as large as any that had visited Fremantle for some years, to come alongside the jetty to discharge and receive cargo, instead of having to lay out in the roads, and be discharged into lighters or steamers, which, he need hardly point out, entailed considerable extra expense, which extra expense, it might be said, operated indirectly upon the community. The last vessel that brought out rails from England, the *Hyderabad*, was nearly two months in discharging her cargo, whereas if she had been able to come alongside the jetty the operation would have been accomplished in about a week. No wonder that the owners of vessels, as well as the shippers and importers of goods, complained at this tantalising and expensive delay. Then again there was the case of the *Helena Mena*, which, although she arrived here some months ago, with only half cargo, had only very recently succeeded in discharging all her cargo, which, with proper conveniences, might have been done in a few days. This was not in consequence of rough weather, but simply because they could not come alongside the jetty. With the expenditure of this £20,000 all these English vessels would be able to do so, and, as he had already pointed out, it would be a great saving both of time and money. More than that it would go a great way to remove the stigma which at present attached to the harbor at Fremantle. Complaints were being constantly received from ship-owners in England because of the serious delays which took place. It might be

remembered that when this question of jetty extension was referred to Sir John Coode, he stated that it would in no way interfere with any future scheme of harbor works, of a more extensive character, that might be undertaken. It was evident now that some years must elapse before any scheme of magnitude could be carried out, and he submitted it would be unwise to allow the colony to be subjected to the present inconveniences, and to have the bad name of the harbor perpetuated for years longer, when we had this £20,000 at our disposal, and when so much might be done with it to provide the necessary facilities. He understood that a very advantageous offer had been made to the Government for the extension of the jetty, which would enable the work to be commenced at once. Or, if the House preferred, tenders might be called for the work, which if undertaken now would afford employment to a large number of artisans and other workmen. It might be said that this work would benefit the town of Fremantle alone, but he submitted such was not the case. The present absence of facilities for loading and unloading vessels affected the people of Perth and other parts of the colony, equally as well as the inhabitants of Fremantle. He believed that unless something were done at once to improve the shipping facilities at the port of Fremantle, the result would be, that, as soon as the Beverley-Albany railway was opened for traffic, it would be found that such facilities and conveniences would be afforded to shipping at Albany that a large amount of trade would be diverted from Fremantle to that port. He had brought the matter forward in the interests of shipping and of the principal port of the colony, and he hoped hon. members would give the motion their support.

**THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Hon. J. A. Wright) said, while sympathising with everything that had fallen from the hon. member for Toodyay, as to what he had said as to the increased conveniences which had been afforded by the recent extension of the jetty—and he was glad to hear that fact acknowledged by one so competent to form an opinion on the subject; while also agreeing with the hon. member that what he now proposed to do would

afford still greater facilities, and that it would in no way interfere with Sir John Coode's scheme; still he would ask the hon. member to allow the matter to stand over, for another six weeks, or until the House met again. By that time he trusted that Sir John Coode's replies to the further inquiries which had been made to him, at the request of that House, would have been received, and they would be in a better position to deal with the whole question. Much as he would like to see the work commenced, he thought it would be better to wait a few weeks longer, until Sir John Coode's communication came to hand.

**MR. A. FORREST** thought the matter ought to be dealt with this session, and action taken at once. There was a great dearth of employment at the present time, and why should they delay the consideration of this question and other questions simply to enable a few hon. members to take a trip to Sydney? The money had been voted for Fremantle, and that town ought to get it.

**MR. LAYMAN** opposed the motion. The money which it was proposed to spend on this jetty had been voted for harbor works, and it ought to be appropriated for that purpose, and no other. He was afraid that the object of the motion was simply to obtain an expenditure of public money, and he should object to it.

**MR. MARMION** said it was not his intention to travel over the old ground with which they were all so familiar, in relation to this question of harbor works at Fremantle. Hon. members were aware that in the last Loan Bill a sum of £105,000 had been voted for these works, and it was well enough known that out of that sum £60,000 had already been diverted for the construction of another work, besides other smaller sums, and now they were asked to divert a further amount. He really must object to all these diversions of money voted for a specific purpose, and a purpose the utility and necessity of which was acknowledged on all hands. Much as shipping interests might demand a further and immediate improvement of the jetty, it would be an altogether unjustifiable experiment to commence the work before the arrival of Sir John Coode's second report. In this matter of

harbor works it was sometimes stated that the people of Fremantle cared little for the actual harbor but a very great deal for the expenditure of the loan money which the construction of the works would entail. Such remarks were unworthy of consideration. It was not too much to say that whenever this question of harbor works had been under consideration, Fremantle people had exhibited a remarkable degree of moderation. It had been stated that the amount which it was now proposed to expend upon the jetty was the unexpended balance of the £105,000 lying to the credit of the vote; but he would remind the House of the fact that it was pledged to restore the £79,000 already reappropriated, so that in reality there was a sum of nearly £100,000 virtually at their disposal, for no further loan could be entered upon until the money which had been diverted from the 1884 loan was restored. Having this sum at their disposal for harbor works, and bearing in mind that there was a possibility of a modified scheme being received from their Marine Engineer the cost of which would justify the Government in proceeding with the work, he thought it most desirable they should wait until they received Sir John Coode's report, which would be in the hands of the Government before next session. It was only a few days ago that they were told by the Government that they did not at present intend to proceed with the Reappropriation Bill which they had introduced at an earlier stage of the session; yet here they were going to request the Government to reappropriate a large sum of money. He must protest against this policy of reappropriation, except under clearly exceptional circumstances. There were other reasons why this work should not be undertaken at once. For years past he had insisted upon the necessity of the House being furnished with plans and specifications of any important public works proposed to be undertaken, before that House should be allowed to sanction the work, and he believed a promise was made that in future this would be done. In this case they had no plans nor specifications, nor any information whatever, beyond the fact that the jetty, if extended as proposed, would carry it into 20ft. of water. Was

the House, upon such meagre information as that, going to sanction the expenditure of £20,000, without further consideration. He hoped the House would consent to a postponement of the question until, at any rate, they received the report which they were expecting from Sir John Coode, in reply to inquiries submitted to him at its own request.

MR. VENN also was of opinion that it would be desirable to postpone the consideration of the expenditure of this money as proposed, until they were in possession of Sir John Coode's report.

MR. SHENTON, seeing that it was the wish of the House that the motion should not at present be proceeded with, moved that the Chairman leave the chair.

Agreed to.

The House resumed.

#### MESSAGE (No. 3): THE ESTIMATES FOR 1888.

THE SPEAKER announced the receipt of the following Message from His Excellency the Governor:

"The Governor has the honor to thank the Honorable the Legislative Council for their Address No. 4, of the 30th December, 1887, intimating that the Council had agreed to a grant of £86,831 on account of the Public Service for the first quarter of the year 1888.

"2. The Governor understands that your Honorable House would prefer that the course, referred to in his opening speech, of retrenching the public expenditure should be immediately entered upon, rather than that the finances of 1888 should be equalised, as has been proposed, by any repayment from loan funds.

"3. With regard to this, the Governor fully agrees that the reduction of expenditure is, in general, the soundest way of overcoming financial difficulty, and the Governor only proposed another expedient in the belief that the difficulty was temporary, and that, in the circumstances, Your Honorable House might, perhaps, not think it unfair to assist the Revenue of 1888 by returning to it, from Loan, some of the Public Works expenditure which has of late fallen very heavily upon current funds.

"4. Having, however, gathered that this view is not entertained by the

"majority of Your Honorable House, and feeling assured of your support in the matter, the Governor is prepared to undertake at once the task of making considerable reductions in the ordinary expenditure of Administration.

"5. The Estimates of 1888 will, therefore, not be proceeded with as at present framed. They will be carefully and thoroughly reconsidered, and reduced on the Expenditure side. Having been recast, they will be presented again to your Honorable House, before the expiration of the first quarter of the year.

"6. The Governor has now felt in a position to direct the acceptance of a tender for the erection of the line of telegraph from Derby to the Kimberley Goldfields. You will be consulted during the present Session respecting further expenditure of the balance of the 1884 Loan.

"Government House, Perth, 4th January, 1888."

#### REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE STATEMENT FOR 1887.

MR. MARMION moved, in accordance with notice, as follows: "That in the opinion of this Council it is advisable and expedient that the usual annual statement of revenue and expenditure for the year 1887, together with the ordinary loan, and other statements, connected with general revenue, should be made publicly known at as early a date as possible, with a view to throw light upon the present financial position of the colony."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) replied that the statement referred to would be published, as in past years, in January, probably about the 19th.

#### ESPERANCE BAY TO HAMPTON PLAINS RAILWAY SYNDICATE.

MR. A. FORREST, in accordance with notice, moved that the proposals of Messrs. Stone and Burt, asking for a definite decision as to the original proposal of the Esperance Bay - Hampton Plains Railway Syndicate be taken into consideration at once by the House. At the last session the House, upon the recommendation of a select committee, adopted a resolution suggesting that the

syndicate should be communicated with, asking whether they would not be prepared to adopt an alternative route from that which they proposed. This had been done. The syndicate had received the proposal submitted to them by the House—that they should run their line from York to Hampton Plains, instead of from Esperance Bay—and they had decided that they could not entertain the proposal. It was very necessary, under the circumstances, that the House should arrive at some definite decision on the subject.

CAPTAIN FAWCETT seconded the motion.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said he rose to ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion. Although, personally, he was in favor of the acceptance of the original proposals, the hon. member was aware that they did not meet with the approval of the House. Why, therefore, press his motion? Neither the House nor the Government were prepared to arrive at any decision in the matter, and he hoped the hon. member would see the propriety of not pressing his resolution.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) suggested that the matter might be postponed until next session, when perhaps the House might be disposed to give the question further consideration. The matter, he might observe, had been discussed in very bad taste in the columns of the public press by certain writers, whose veil of anonymity was so transparent that there was no difficulty in detecting their personality. The question, at any rate, had better be postponed until it could be discussed with more calmness and equanimity than it was likely to be discussed at present.

MR. HENSMAN said he intended to support the motion. It simply asked for a definite answer to a definite proposal, which had already been fully discussed in that House, and he thought this syndicate had a right to expect a prompt decision with regard to their offer. He did not express any opinion with regard to the merits of the scheme, but he did think that some immediate steps should be taken to dispose of the matter at issue, for a proposal of this character, in which a vast amount of capital was in-

volved, should not be allowed to hang fire for ever.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. C. N. Warton) said that like his hon. colleague the Colonial Secretary he was strongly in favor of the adoption of the syndicate's proposals, and he was sorry that last session was allowed to pass without the opportunity being availed of. He did not think, however, it would be in the interests of the promoters themselves that the matter should be pushed to an issue that evening. At the same time he was alive to the danger of delaying to deal with proposals made to them by capitalists at home.

MR. KEANE said as he supported the syndicate's proposals last session he intended doing so again. He was glad to hear the Colonial Secretary and the Attorney General expressing their opinions in favor of the scheme. It was really quite refreshing to hear the members of the Government actually speaking out their own minds. He hoped a decision would soon be come to in the matter, for it was a discredit to the colony to deal with large proposals like these in the manner they were being dealt with. Unless they did the business of the colony in a better style than at present, the result would be that no one outside the colony would attempt to do any business with it.

MR. LAYMAN was understood to support the motion, on the ground that the question having already been fully discussed in the House, they were in a position to say "yes" or "no" to the proposals.

MR. PARKER said that last session it was decided that the promoters of the scheme should be communicated with. Had this been done? If so, had any reply been received from them?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said the promoters had been written to by the Government, but no direct reply had been received from them.

MR. A. FORREST said the reply received through Messrs. Stone and Burt was the reply of the promoters.

MR. PARKER thought it would be better for all parties that the question should be postponed until next session. Allusion had been made to the business of the House being hurried through in order that certain members might pro-

ceed to Sydney. He did not see why, if a few members chose to go away, the others should not sit and do the work.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said it had been stated that in dealing with this question as the House had dealt with it, they were not treating English capitalists fairly,—that the colony was not dealing fairly with this syndicate. He thought, himself, that the colony had suffered more at the hands of capitalists than capitalists had suffered at the hands of that House. During last session, the House had simply made a counter proposal, which was considered to be more advantageous to the colony than that submitted to the syndicate. There seemed to be a lukewarm feeling with regard to this scheme, and that, he thought, arose because there was very little belief in it. To him it seemed a most visionary scheme—simply a big land sale boom. But though the proposal of the House had been rejected, there was no reason why that of the company should be entertained. The House's proposal was a more advantageous one for the colony, and the syndicate would doubtless have got more liberal terms if they had adopted it. He did not think that it was likely that the scheme would ever be carried out. But the offer of the payment of £170,000 was a very tempting one, and he did not suppose that any very great harm would be done, if the scheme of the syndicate were considered. He hoped, however, that the hon. member who had brought forward the motion would see that he had brought it forward at a very late period of the session, and that he would agree to the postponement of the debate upon the question until the House met again.

MR. MARMION said, as to considering the interests of capitalists they were there to consider the interests of the colony, and not the interests of capitalists. He did not think it would be to the advantage of the colony to adopt the proposals of this syndicate, as, in his opinion, the colony would gain nothing by the transaction. Therefore he thought that House should not give its countenance to it. He thought they ought to wait and see the result of the two land-grant railways already in course of construction—one of which was being brought to a successful issue, while the

other was at present under a cloud—before they granted any further concessions of this character. If the railways at present sanctioned turned out a success, as they all hoped they would, he did not think the colony would require the aid of these capitalists, those kind-hearted people, those philanthropic individuals, who were willing to invest their money in Western Australia—not for their own good, of course, but to promote the interests of the colony.

Mr. RICHARDSON expressed himself in favor of the consideration of the subject being postponed.

The motion, upon being put, was negatived on the voices.

#### PETITION (No. 3): DUTY ON BEER.

Mr. PEARSE presented a petition from the licensed victuallers of Fremantle, and others, against the imposition of a further duty on imported beer.

The petition was received.

#### COASTAL STEAM SERVICE: FRESH CONTRACT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) submitted the report of the select committee appointed to consider the question of entering into a fresh contract for the performance of the coastal steam service, the present contract terminating in February, 1888. A provisional agreement had, however, been made with the present contractors, the Adelaide Steamship Company, for carrying on the service for a further term of six months. The Committee had diligently considered and discussed the whole subject submitted for their consideration, and after due deliberation they had come to the following conclusions: in the first place, that tenders should be called for such services, for a term of five years, from the 1st August, 1888, on conditions based on the report adopted by the House last session, and that those tenders should be sent in by the 1st June, next. He moved that the report be adopted.

Mr. HENSMAN: Do I understand that we are asked to at once adopt the recommendations of the select committee on this important question? I think it

ought to be considered on some future day.

Mr. LAYMAN concurred with the hon. member for Greenough that the consideration of the report ought to be postponed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said the report was simply an echo of what the select committee recommended last session, and what that House had agreed to. What was there to discuss beyond inviting tenders?

Mr. VENN would have preferred if the committee had recommended that tenders be called for an alternative service for three years, as well as a five-year service. He did not think it was wise to subsidise steamers for a longer period than was absolutely necessary, or beyond the time when trade developed to such an extent as to make a service remunerative without the payment of any subsidy. The select committee of last year considered that there was no longer any occasion to pay a subsidy towards the maintenance of steamers engaged in the intercolonial trade, between this colony and South Australia, and also that there would be no necessity for subsidising a mail service between Fremantle and Albany after the completion of the railway. In those recommendations he fully concurred. He hoped, as he said last year, that, in any new contract entered into, the conveniences of the Southern people would be studied a little more than they were at present, and that the Southern districts would have no such cause for complaint as they had under the present contract.

Mr. A. FORREST observed that, unless tenders were called for five years, it would be playing into the hands of one company, and they might as well not call for tenders at all.

Mr. LAYMAN said the report might be a very good one, but he should have liked more time to consider it. The ports of Bunbury and the Vasse had been almost altogether shut out from participating in any of the advantages of the present contract, and he hoped, with the hon. member for Wellington, that the claims of these districts would be duly recognised in any new contract entered into.

The motion for the adoption of the report was agreed to.

## TARIFF BILL, 1888.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser), in moving the second reading of this bill, said he did so with the most perfect confidence, inasmuch as hon. members had already had the substance of the bill before them, including the schedules, and had agreed to them. It was therefore unnecessary for him to make any remarks upon the bill, or the proposed changes, as no principle was involved in the bill.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said it was his intention to move, as an amendment, that the bill be read a second time that day six months. In his position as Chairman, he had been unable to make any comments upon the various changes proposed, when the report was under consideration in committee; he might therefore be excused if he now availed himself of the opportunity of making one or two remarks. The Colonial Secretary, in moving the second reading of the bill, said that it involved no principle. The bill, indeed, was all against principle, and as a matter of fact there was a most important principle destroyed by the proposed tariff. He moved that the bill be read that day six months, because he was opposed to the country being committed to a policy of Protection without having had an opportunity of expressing its views upon it. It might be said that the tariff, which he feared they were likely to pass that night, was only a sort of variation of the tariff now in force, but he thought he was justified in saying that the present tariff was distinctly a revenue tariff. In the course of the discussion in committee, hon. members on the Government bench had stated that the policy involved in the proposed tariff was in accordance with the resolution passed in the House last session, in which it was stated that the new tariff should aim at furthering trade and settlement. The furthering of trade and settlement was an admirable thing, but it might be effected without any protective policy. They should cheapen the cost of production—not increase the cost of products. The Government of New Zealand had recently taken this view of the subject. In that colony protectionists had gone to the wall. The Government had promised to take up no questions relative to further-

ing the interests of trade, but it was distinctly stated that whatever was done in regard to the tariff should be simply reduction of the cost of production in every possible way. There was one item in the new tariff against which, in the interests of his constituents, he must protest. He alluded to the heavy import duty upon meat. Hon. members would perhaps remember what a row was occasioned in the Eastern colonies by Victoria placing a duty of 6d. per head upon sheep and 2s. 6d. per head upon bullocks, and here was Western Australia putting a duty of 2s. 6d. per head upon sheep and 30s. per head upon bullocks for the purpose simply of producing scarcity and dearness of meat in the Plantagenet District. Why was the duty imposed if it was not to increase the price of meat in order that the local producers might have a higher net profit? Meat in the district was selling at 9d. to 10d. per pound, and if those few gentlemen who had flocks of sheep which they could not dispose of had only the energy to set up at Albany in opposition to the single butcher in possession, they would be perfectly well able to sell their sheep at a good price. But because that single butcher could get sheep more cheaply from the other colonies—because it suited him to get his meat from there instead of from the local producers, the whole of the inhabitants of the Plantagenet District were to be punished by having their meat raised to an extortionate price and to an extravagant degree. It was, he feared, useless to talk about political economy, as hon. members had discarded that science. In England at the present day no statesman of the first rank would dream of proposing a protective policy. In America the people were coming to the conclusion that protection was a fallacy and the Democratic ticket in the Presidential Election would be a demand for the remission of taxation which increased to wage earners the cost of living. Victoria was put forward as an example of what Protection would do, but it had been shown that only 45,000 of the 1,000,000 inhabitants of that colony were benefited by Protection, and that it would pay to keep them at the expense of the State and do away with the protective tariff. A protective pamphlet issued from the

Age office to which he had referred, coolly included amongst the Victorian exports the wool of the great Riverina District, when, as they all knew, that district was in New South Wales. That fact alone convinced him of the utter unreliability of the whole pamphlet. Then there was the singular fact that Victoria with her protective tariff employed a smaller number of adult males in manufactories than did New South Wales. All the leading newspapers of Australia were opposed to Protection, and surely that should be taken as a reason why they should pause before adopting it. Protection, however, was a favorite cry of trading politicians, because the working classes liked to have promise of high wages and plenty of work. No one would wish they should not do so; but, if they got high wages and plenty of work by Protection, it was at the expense of the consumers. So far as this colony was concerned, Protection was directly opposed to what they wished to bring about—the settlement of the land. It was an acknowledged fact that Protection instead of encouraging settlement had a contrary effect; it caused people to concentrate in the larger towns instead of going into the country. That had been proved to be the fact in Victoria, and that was one of the reasons given against Protection in New Zealand. The accomplishment of the settlement of the land would, he believed, be frustrated by the adoption of a Protection policy. He considered that all those who were opposed to a protective policy were bound to protest against the Government and against the majority of the House committing them to Protection, without the country having had an opportunity of considering the matter, and committing itself deliberately one way or the other. Under these circumstances he felt it his duty to move, as an amendment upon the original motion, that the bill be read a second time that day six months.

MR. RICHARDSON, in seconding the amendment, said it was an unheard of thing that a colony should be committed to a protective policy, all at once like this, when the object was simply to increase the revenue. Possibly it was little use talking in that House about political economy, in view of the lament-

able ignorance of the elementary principles of the subject which had been displayed in connection with this tariff. For his own part, as regards the principles of Protection, he could only turn from member to member in bewilderment, and ask what they meant by Protection, and ask where its advantages really lay. They had some avowedly protectionist members urging that one article should be taxed because it could be, but was not, made in the colony. They had others advocating that another article should be taxed because it could not by any possibility be made in the colony. They were to throw a sop to the North by taxing what the South imported, and they were to please the South by taxing what the North used. It was really bewildering this kind of thing. Protection, they were told, was intended to give better wages by raising the price of certain commodities; at the same time they were assured that Protection would not enhance the price of commodities to the consumer. The "poor man" was to be taxed, but to be taxed solely for his own benefit, and, in reality, he would be richer for it. But the rich man was also to be taxed, to make amends for the taxing of the poor man, though it be for the poor man's own good. They were to tax necessities, in order to make the colony produce them, and they were to tax luxuries in order to increase the revenue by placing them beyond the reach of the general consumer. Victoria was the colony they generally looked to as the example *par excellence* of the successful effects of a protective policy. Protection, it was said, was the lever which had raised that colony to her present position. But it seemed to him, as he had said on a former occasion, that Victoria had prospered in spite of Protection, not in consequence of Protection. Her own rich internal resources provided her with the elements of success. The main reason urged in favor of increasing the duties upon most of the articles upon which it had been increased was that it would encourage local manufacturing industries. The fact of the matter was, this colony was not ripe for manufacturing industries, and, while they were endeavoring to legislate in this way, why should they impose further burdens upon other industries, and those en-



gaged in them, the main industries of the colony, the pastoral industry, the timber industry, and the pearl industry? As he said the other day, why should the vast majority of the community be taxed in order to enable a few small manufacturers and a few producers to make more profit? Why should they, by placing a higher duty on cereals, contribute a premium to the inactivity and want of energy of our own growers? Would it not be better to point out to them that other growers, in other places, produce at prices that paid them, and which paid the importer after paying freight and all charges? The same principle should apply to all other industries. He thought that any industry, be it agricultural or what not, that required to be propped up in the manner in which it was proposed to prop up certain industries by means of this tariff, must be in a very rotten state. A great point was sought to be made about "keeping the money in the colony," the inference being that we paid for our imports with money; whereas in reality all international trade was barter pure and simple. This had been clearly demonstrated over and over again: and anyone could satisfy himself of it if he looked at the Blue Book. We imported what other countries could produce more cheaply than we can of commodities we require, and we gave in exchange commodities we can produce more cheaply than they can; and this mutual business was profitable to both countries. The hon. member appealed to the House to pause before committing the country to a tariff such as this, without the country having had an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. It might suit the Government, inasmuch as it would give them an increased revenue; from that point of view the step now taken might be a very judicious step indeed. But it was not statesmanlike nor politic to change the tariff of the colony without an appeal to the country. Once we launched into the troubled waters of Protection, it was impossible to tell when we would ever emerge out of our troubles. He thought that of all the Australian colonies our own was that for which a protective policy was most unsuited, and he hoped it was not yet too late to appeal to hon. members to pause before committing the colony

to this hybrid and most unstatesman-like tariff.

MR. LAYMAN thought the present was a very bad time to interfere with the tariff at all, when the colony was on the eve of constitutional change, and of an appeal to the country. He thought, so far as Protection was concerned, this colony had been protected for a very long time, without the desired result; and he thought we must be content to fall back upon our own resources.

MR. PARKER felt that, at this stage, anything he could say would have but very little weight; they had discussed the question so often and the principles involved. But he thought it his duty, having been a member of the Commission, to say something. He must oppose the idea that this was a Protective tariff. The hon. baronet, the member for Plantagenet, said it was purely a revenue tariff; but it was this in addition—it was a tariff framed with a view to encourage certain native manufactures, and native industries. They must bear in mind the circumstances of the colony. During the last few years large sums of money had been spent on public works, and they had alienated enormous tracts of land by way of concessions to syndicates, one of which, and the most important of which, the syndicate formed for the construction of the Beverley-Albany railway, had, while those works were in progress, been drawing their supplies to a great extent, he believed, from the other colonies. One would have thought that these syndicates, looking at the concessions made to them by this colony, would at least have obtained their supplies within the colony; but they preferred going outside, and the present tariff was intended to put some check upon these importations, and to that extent it might perhaps be regarded as a Protective tariff. It must also be remembered that we were introducing immigrants into the colony, so as to increase the population, in the hope that the railways which we had built and were building might be made to pay. Now it must be obvious that unless the lands alongside these lines were settled, these railways would become a burden to the public funds. So far as the settlement of the soil was concerned, the main proposal of the Commission with regard to

the settlement of the soil was to place all agricultural implements on the free list. If the Commission had desired to embark in a really Protective tariff, it must be obvious they would have placed a higher duty on flour and potatoes, and many other articles of produce. He submitted that the idea of the Commission was not to provide a Protective tariff; if it had, the question would first have been referred to the country. The idea of the Commission was to give encouragement to those local industries and manufactures which, by obtaining this support, were likely to flourish in our midst, and so afford employment to a number of workmen who would otherwise leave the colony. We wanted to increase our population and to find work for them; but he was sorry to see that the other colonies had already drawn away many of the skilled artisans introduced here at the public expense. The object was primarily to manufacture in our midst what we required for our own use and consumption, and this could not be done without initial assistance. People in comparatively small communities like this would not embark in local enterprises unless they had some assurance of success and assistance; and it was just a question of whether we were going to send our money away to pay foreign artisans and workmen, or keep it to pay our own men. He did not consider himself a strong protectionist, but he did believe that in a young country like this we might with advantage protect our native industries to a certain extent, which was all the present tariff sought to do.

Mr. HENSMAN would like to say a few words—not that he thought it would influence hon. members one way or the other, after all the discussions they had had upon this tariff question. His objection to this bill was not based merely upon the details of the schedules; but he had a primary objection to it altogether, and his objection to it was this—that when a Commission like this Tariff Commission was appointed, to frame a tariff, with certain definite objects in view, their instructions also being that, in the attainment of those objects, they should not materially interfere with the revenue, it was only reasonable that when the Commission completed their task

and brought up their report they should, in that report, set forth their reasons for arriving at the conclusions which they did, and show that the revenue would not be injuriously affected, so that anyone reading their report could say, "You have proved your case." But they had nothing of that sort in this report. Therefore, in the present position of the finances of the colony, when we wanted every penny we could get, he objected to this tariff, because there was nothing to show that there would be any increase or any diminution of the revenue. He had a further objection to the proposed tariff—although it was brought in as a sort of Protective "Nobody's Child," it had subsequently been acknowledged by the Government; and he did not think it was right that the Government should alter our fiscal system, on its death-bed. This tariff question had never been referred to the constituencies. It was said that the Commission desired—as every true patriot desired—to promote native industries. Who would be fool enough to say to the contrary? But what was there to show that this tariff would have that effect? One thing was very certain—it would have the effect of raising the price of living to everyone. And to what more serious determination could any colony commit itself than one involving a substantial increase all round in the cost of living? This increase, Protectionists said, was attended by counterbalancing advantages; but it was for the community—that was to say, for the people who were interested—to say whether they had made out their case or not. To attempt to entangle the colony in the fatal coils of Protection without first inviting the constituencies to declare their views, precisely and deliberately, was to ignore all the dictates of constitutional procedure. "Great things had small beginnings." Our first lapse into Protection might be tentative; but, once having admitted the principle, it would be very difficult to abandon the position. They were now going back to a state of things which would be shocking to politicians in England. There was no politician in England who, at the present day, would dare to advocate a tax upon the people's food. It had been suggested that this change in the tariff had not

been fully discussed by the community. Still, he could not but think that people must be aware of the effect that this new tariff would have. There were two ways of taxation—direct and indirect; and the advantage of direct taxation was that everyone felt it at once, and asked was it necessary; whereas with indirect taxation it might not be felt at once, and, although bad in principle, it was pursued in England. It might not appear immediately apparent, if this tariff should pass; but, sooner or later, people would find that every tax which was put on imports, and especially on articles of food, would come home to the consumer, and he would feel it. The hon. member concluded by again protesting against a moribund Government interfering with the fiscal system of the country without an appeal to the constituencies.

MR. RANDELL said whatever might be said of the tariff now before them it was there at the request of that House itself, as the outcome of the deliberations of a Commission which that House had requested the Government to appoint. There had been a general expression of opinion that the existing tariff was found to act prejudicially towards some of the most important industries of the colony. No doubt the tariff as submitted by the Commission had been considerably manipulated in its passage through the House, and in the direction of Protection. A great deal had been said about the evils of Protection; but he thought it was absurd to compare the position and circumstances of this colony with that of England, or other countries that had been referred to. He thought we were quite able to form an independent judgment, without reference to John Stuart Mill or any other teacher of political economy. It appeared to him that all that superabundance of instances drawn from other countries might at once be set aside as superfluous and non-pertinent. Not a single place was mentioned whose circumstances were at all analogous to those of this colony, and, failing such analogy, their experiences were neither relevant nor instructive. Western Australia ought to be sufficient for herself in this matter. Our own colonists must surely be able by this time to form an independent opinion as to the needs and capabilities of their

country, without being obliged to grope about among the experiences of distant lands entirely dissimilar in origin, existence, and environment. As a matter of fact, Western Australia, even with its present tariff, could not be regarded as a Free Trade colony; its policy had always been more or less protective; it was absurd therefore to talk about Protection as if it were an entirely new thing. For a long time past he had been in favor of a protective policy for this colony. He believed in a modified protectionist tariff as the most suitable for it. As to what the hon. member for the North had said about "keeping money in the colony," one thing was certain: whatever money might be called, it was found very useful; nor could there be any disputing that to have plenty of it in circulation was a very good thing for everyone. It was not necessary, he thought, for him at this stage to discuss the schedules; but, if he were to express an opinion with regard to them, he thought he would be in favor of the recommendations of the Commission rather than of the revised schedules. He thought the suggestions of the Commission were more likely to conduce to the interests of the colony. He thought, however, that the committee perhaps had been justified in restoring the  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. duty, in view of the necessity for providing as much revenue as we could in the present position of our finances. Still he thought the Commission, when they were conducting their inquiry, were justified in suggesting the proposed reduction. It was his intention to support the second reading of the bill, in the belief that the new tariff would be more beneficial to the community at large.

MR. VENN said: As the bill is now before the House regulating and rearranging our Customs duties, and as the Government have pronounced so decidedly in favor of what might be considered Protection, I think it well for those who feel any interest in the protective policy to express their views, more especially since the hon. member for Greenough has at last given us his sentiments from the other side of the question. We had, previous to this, the views of one hon. member for the North, who came fully prepared for mortal combat against anything bearing even the color of Protection. We heard his speech with interest

and profit, and we have seen since how much the interests of a member's district may play upon his principles, and lead him to submit to have such violence done to convictions so pronounced, as the member for the North. I was content at the time to listen passively to all that fell from the hon. member, feeling that his remarks deserved a reply at another stage of the question, instead of then prolonging the debate, and before we discussed the schedule. The time has now arrived, and I think it is incumbent on every man, who takes an interest in legislation, any pronounced legislation, to examine the question as intelligently as he can, not to take for granted the views of others, but to give reasons for his own convictions, to give point—as it were—to the question, and not be content to sit languidly in an arm chair smoking aromatic tobacco, dealing out superlative generalities from the store house of one's own wisdom—predicting chaos and disaster to the colony by false legislation. I repeat, let us rise above that, and here—on the debating ground of the Legislature—combat our opinions, and, if we are reflective men, show cause why we hold those opinions. Of course it is an important question this tariff question, and no one was more pleased to hear the hon. member for the North address himself to the subject than I was. Altogether he holds adverse views to mine; still we have one common object in view—the progress of this colony. That is the beacon to which we are all steering. It is the one common centre, and therefore in our arguments there need be no hostility, as the object in view is the same. I challenge argument in a friendly way, and I hope my views on Protection—as applied to the country we are living in—have a little more in them than bare assertions, and if I choose purposely to interweave the word Protection through the meshes of law and political economy it is for these gentlemen of adverse views to perform the feat of disenchantment, by exposing my errors and my false logic. Protection is the fundamental principle underlying all law, the rights of property, and social order. It is the instinct of the savage to acquire food by hunting or by strategy. It is the primary and instructive law of his tribe to

recognise his right of property, when acquired, by protecting him in the ownership of his acquisition, and so give him a right to dispose of his property—the fruits of his intelligence, his skill, or his labor, as he may think proper. Protection is thus one of the first laws, and where Protection in the rights of property is not recognised no social order or national progress can be made, as the stimulus to acquire ceases to exist without it. Protection and security are a *sine quâ non* of all industry. Protection enables exertion, enterprise, industry, frugality, and intellect to reap their full reward, and is the spur and motive power to success. It gives hope to achievement without inflicting on others loss, injury, or injustice, and without it the whole system of law and order would become a chaos; the rich would become poor; the strong would tyrannise over the weak; the law of Might would prevail and result in tyranny, opposition, barbarism, and poverty. That is the abstract principle. Now let me show how minutely it enters into every walk of life; how it surrounds nearly every undertaking with its influence. What is the law of patents and trade marks? Is it not Protection to every conceivable trade, to every new utility, idea or inspiration? What is admission to the Bar for the barrister and solicitor, and what is our local ordinance for the punishment of those who are not duly qualified to practise in our Courts of Law? Is not that Protection? What is the meaning of a diploma to medical men? Is that not Protection to the man and to the public; to the man to secure recognition and full play for his talents and for his years of laborious intellectual slavery; to the public against the charlatan, the quack and impostor? What is the meaning of licenses to surveyors, and why had we special legislation on their behalf? Was it not for Protection? To what must we ascribe licenses to the publicans, auctioneers, and hawkers, if it is not to Protection, in one form or the other? What is the spirit that pervades the charters of the various friendly societies? Good Templars and Rechabites, the Orders of the Druids, the Oddfellows, and Freemasons. Are they not all protected by their charters for their own peculiar objects? What is

the meaning of the different Trades Unions and the thousand and one combinations constantly in force through all branches of commercial and mercantile pursuits, if they are not for Protection. What is the principle during those great industrial strikes that rescues and adjusts the questions of capital and labor during those critical and convulsive times when industries are paralysed and commerce threatened, but Protection? Leaving those questions and touching another phase of our social life, why are ministers of religion ordained in the different churches and creeds, but for the Protection of those churches and creeds? What is the law of copyright, and why has it been thought wise to legislate and to confer exclusive rights on the products of the brain in its noblest efforts, whether in writing, in art painting, in drawing, or in sculpture, if it is not the principle of Protection? The hon. member for Geleenough, I well remember, spoke eloquently when that bill was before the House, and how can he for one moment doubt the principle of Protection? Again, to come to our pleasures and our pastimes, what is the use of the totalisator, that modern machine for speculation, but to save the public from fraud, by its protection? What gives force to racing penalties on different animals in handicaps, and the adjustment of the various classes of race, but Protection? It is the spirit of Protection that brings each animal to compete—on equal footing—to start as near as possible without advantage, which is the essence of the sport. I have not exhausted the whole category wherein this vital principle of Protection works, but I hope I have shown generally how the question enters into daily life and how it has become a part of ourselves. The hon. member for the North, when addressing himself to the question from a Free Trader's standpoint, furnished the House with a list of the different trades, and asked how they were going to benefit by this mania for Protection. I have partly answered that question by showing how the spirit already pervades those trades, and I would briefly say in addition, and as an answer to the question, where profits are high it leads to comparatively increased wealth and population; but where profits are low it means less em-

ployment of labor, less accumulation, less material prosperity. A country must not only flourish in proportion to its capital, but in the capacity and facilities it gives to the employment of capital to industrial pursuits. Capital is employed for the purpose of reproduction in the form of profit, and we find this man and that man embarking in different enterprises, anticipating a return of profit on the investment, and thus industries can only flourish in proportion to the return they give to investment. And the ability of those who invest, to direct labor towards the best results, the guarantee to all investments in all pursuits, whether mechanical or industrial, is the selling value of the article produced. But commercial activity being so much on the alert, and competition being now so keen, values all over the world are regulated and equalised by rapid transit at low freights, and by the wonderful triumphs science has made, enabling speculation to place produce in foreign markets fresh, and in active competition with the products of those markets, to the injury of the producers not so well placed and to the comparative loss of the country, by withdrawing capital that should be circulated, and not taken away. Providence has given to different countries different soils, different climates, different powers of production, and man with his intelligence, his ingenuity, and his skill should always acknowledge this Divine provision, and encourage these products when nature gives so much gratuitous assistance. By the intelligent recognition of this great law we have countries famous for producing different staple articles of commercial exchange, such as corn, tea, sugar, rice, spice, and a thousand and one other commodities that can only be possibly raised and exported from those favored localities. To attempt the cultivation of these products under conditions opposed to this law is to court failure and secure disappointment. The recognition of that principle is the basis of all commercial enterprise. The honorable member for the North said protection was the bolstering up of one trade at the cost of another. I differ with him, and say there is no such thing as one industry preying on the other. Profit is the excess of produce raised

"during given periods in excess of "the consumption of those periods," in which all trades and industries participate and all share alike. It is a division of labor by separation, and combination, and by which production is increased to the mutual advantage of all; and, let me remark, whatever appearances may be, however commerce or "manufactures may seem to flourish—if the "rates of profit are low in a country we "can fairly predict that poverty is creeping over that country, and that sooner "or later measures will have to be devised "to relieve the strain on her resources, "by adding to the productiveness of that "country's industries." This may be done through taxation, as increased taxation may, and does, act as a stimulant to industry so long as that taxation is within reasonable bounds, and such as can be fairly overcome; for individuals, in order not to feel the incidence of taxation, must apply themselves, with greater zeal, more skill, and more industry, to their avocations. Fair and reasonable taxation is therefore a wise provision of legislation. Over-taxation, on the contrary, may lead to poverty and despair. To apply the principle of Protection by legislative enactments through the Customs, in a new country, appears to me the simple dictate of common sense and expediency, to protect and encourage young industries on the one hand and to obtain a revenue on the other. No young country can at first compete with the established industries of older countries, and until all industries (favorable to the country) are established on a firm basis, yielding fair and customary profits on the investments—until ingenuity is quickened by success, until science and arts are a moving principle among her inhabitants, until her people are well educated in mechanical and industrial pursuits, until production exceeds local demands, until we are ready to become exporters—we must apply the principle of Protection. The human instinct of self-preservation prompts this, as I have already shown; but, having once reached that stage, protection has no further force, and restriction may be withdrawn to challenge competition. It then becomes a test of the education, industry, and ability of one country against another. Then the greatest spur to pro-

gress, enterprise, and invention is free intercourse with the world and an equal footing. "Free trade is impartial trade. General duties raised for revenue purposes is Free Trade, as it is neither partial, oppressive, nor unjust!" In touch with this question occurs the one of values, and, as I have before remarked in this House, the cost or real value of commodities is, or should be regulated, by the cost of production. Values are, however, subject to the fluctuations of the labor and skill employed in production as well as the demand. To promote healthy production the demand must be active to effectually cover the cost and risk of production, leaving a fair margin of profit. When demand is not equal to the production of any particular industry, values decline, the industry languishes, and capital is eventually withdrawn from it. Then less production leads to lighter values; thus supply and demand regulate each other. This withdrawal of capital, however, from any given industry, in a new country, is often disastrous to that industry, because the capital so withdrawn may be directed into other channels from whence it is not always convenient or judicious to recall it, which may lead to industries being abandoned altogether and difficult to revive. Importations affect values; hence it is wise to foster industries by protective legislation, until such time as they are established on a commercial basis. By commercial basis I mean fair profits on investment. Capital flowing through a country for commodities locally produced must lead to better results than when capital is sent out of a country for ordinary supplies instead of commodities sent in exchange—the money is more diffused among the people. At the same time it is to exports we must eventually look for great material wealth and progress. The whole fabric of commercial enterprise is based on a system of exchange, and as a country becomes prosperous so the wants of its inhabitants expand, new desires, new luxuries, new enjoyments, start into demand and have to be satisfied. Man is so organised as never to be at a standstill; he is essentially a creature of progress. It is the instinctive desire of the mind to triumph over matter. That is the not-to-be-overcome line of demarcation between man

and the lower animals. We must build up our country to the export stage, and not place our industries unfairly in competition, but let the cost of production regulate values, and demand will at all times control profits. These points always seem to escape the notice of those who oppose Protection; they speak sweepingly as though values would always remain to the prejudice of the consumer, which is false argument. Demand controls supply and cost. Let me illustrate this first. We will say, for example's sake, Protection at once gives higher local value to boots, harness, flour, pork, and butter. We will take butter, and say it reaches 2s. 6d. per lb., or 3s., or anything you like; these figures are profitable to the producer, very profitable. He increases the supply, the motive power of profit is at work, and others do the same. More capital is invested in the industry—supply more than overtakes the demand—competition lowers the cost of production, and values decline at once. This principle applies to all industries. Show capital a fair investment, and it will immediately flow in that direction. As water flows by gravitation, so capital flows by profits; and, as I have said when dealing with profits, all share alike,—excess of profits leads to greater production, more power to employ labor and greater security to the laborer. The laborer or the poor man gets full value for his labor, and is placed altogether in a higher standard than when profits are low, and stagnant, and labor cheap and irregular. The more money there is circulated the greater the prosperity, activity, and industry of the people, and the greater the desire to acquire. In countries where labor is lowest, and produce proportionately low, we find no vital activity among the inhabitants. Take India, for instance; there we find silent, if not contented, poverty. Do we not encourage immigration for the purposes of production? And, if fair value for the immigrant's labor is not secured, what is the inducement to remain? He must in sheer self-defence move elsewhere. Land and climate are nought to him if he cannot live. It will not build his home, it will not clothe his children, it will not provide for his declining years, it will not accord him healthy amusement, unless

some profit is the result of his labor. He comes here to improve his condition, to better his status in life; he comes from a country whence Free Trade has probably starved him by having robbed his occupation of profit. He comes to a new country to obtain full value for his labor, and where competition is not so brisk. He does not ask for the blessings of Free Trade, to again turn him out. He seeks protection for himself, his wife, and his family. The hon. the Colonial Secretary, in making his Budget Speech, said he regretted that while the towns had progressed, while we could look round and see monuments of architectural beauty in them, we had made no progressive move in agricultural settlement. He gave no reason. The reason is not far away: it is simply that capital has found more profit (anticipated more profit) in speculative investment about the towns than in the more permanent but less productive industrial pursuits of agriculture. Farming, in direct competition with larger centres of population, and cheaper cost of production, has not yielded or shown sufficient profit to induce capital and settlement in any marked degree. It requires the fostering hand of legislation, for some time, to come to its assistance; and beyond this the pernicious wave of speculation which has swept the colony has led more to the excitement of gambling than to the sober but more elevating pursuits of progressive settlement, as will be the case when this wretched gambling dies out, with the consequent trouble it will bring. We must only hope that under a new constitution Western Australia will make greater strides in agriculture than she has hitherto done. We must, however, never lose sight of the fostering hand of Protection, applied with wisdom and discrimination. This colony under settlement and cultivation has large resources. Read the progress reports of the Commission, and draw your own conclusions. I do not wish to cram Victoria down the throat of the hon. member for the North; he has not quite the capacity to swallow so much; and, what is more, the picture is too distressing; but I might remark that if the colony of Victoria, with its wonderful powers of production, its immense fertility, and great and divers resources, found it well, found it necessary, to protect

those commodities she could produce in such profusion, if it was found wise to foster and stimulate industries, so easy of development, until those industries were thoroughly established, is there not some reason in applying the principle to a country that has less advantages and where profits from production are so much lower? Is there, I say, not reason in giving *quid pro quo* to the laborer, to the artisan, to the agriculturist for his labor, and thus establish him on the soil. Sir, in conclusion, I will say the law which secures to the humblest individual the right and power of securing the fruits of his labor and of his industry in peace, happiness, and contentment is the greatest achievement of legislative forethought, the noblest triumph of human wisdom.

MR. MORRISON said he would like to know upon what principle the House was going to work. One party seemed to go in for Protection, another party for Free Trade, and another for increasing the revenue. That being so, it could not be said as regards this tariff that any particular policy was paramount. He thought the question of Free Trade or Protection ought to be a matter for the country to decide. He could not agree that the proposed tariff was a Protective tariff, and he simply supported the bill in consideration of the necessity of keeping up the revenue. The country had pronounced no verdict on the question of a change of its fiscal policy; that was very certain. Of course he had no constituency himself; the only constituency he had was the colony at large; and, had it not been that we wanted a little more revenue just at this juncture, he should have preferred the old tariff continued, with a slight increase all round.

MR. KEANE said they had been discussing abstract principles for the last five hours, and he was sure if they were to keep talking there for five hours longer no one's opinion would be altered one jot. So far as the bill itself was concerned, he believed in Free Trade, and, on principle, he should support the amendment of the hon. member for Plantagenet. Of course it was absolutely necessary we should have revenue; but, before adopting any definite policy of Protection or Free Trade, the matter, certainly, in his opinion, should have been placed before the country. With regard

to the elaborate speech of the hon. member for Wellington, it must have taken the hon. member a great deal of trouble to prepare, and he hoped it would be read by everyone.

MR. A. FORREST said he should record his vote, as he had done all through, in support of the bill. He saw no good in travelling over the old grounds of Free Trade or Protection. The schedules had been thoroughly discussed in committee, and it was not likely any member was going to stultify himself by voting now in opposition to the way in which he had voted then. It was all very well to talk about Free Trade in a country like England; but surely we ought to know what was best for ourselves. He had been all his life a Protectionist at heart, and, even if he were to lose his seat on the point, he should not change his opinion. They could not twit the Government with having asked to have the tariff revised: the request came from that House itself. He hoped the bill would be passed as agreed to in committee.

The question that the bill be read a second time was then put, and, a division being called for, the numbers were—

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| Ayes ... | 19 |
| Noes ... | 6  |

|              |    |
|--------------|----|
| Majority for | 13 |
|--------------|----|

AYES.  
Mr. H. Brockman  
Mr. E. H. Brockman  
Mr. Congdon  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Layman  
Mr. Leake  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Morrison  
Mr. Parker  
Mr. Pearce  
Mr. Randell  
Mr. Scott  
Mr. Shenton  
Mr. Sholl  
Mr. Venn  
Hon. C. N. Warton  
Hon. J. A. Wright  
Hon. Sir M. Fraser

NOES.  
Captain Fawcett  
Mr. Hensman  
Mr. Keane  
Mr. McRae  
Mr. Richardson  
Sir T. C. Campbell, Bart.  
(Teller.)

(Teller.)

Bill read a second time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) moved that the bill be now considered in committee of the whole House.

Agreed to.

THE SPEAKER left the Chair.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to, *sub silentio*.



## FIRST SCHEDULE:

*(Specific Duties.)*

MR. MARMION moved that the item "Horses, £1," be struck out. He thought there would be great difficulty in enforcing this duty, in view of the frontier line between this colony and South Australia.

MR. A. FORREST: What's the good of talking now?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) hoped the committee would not stultify itself by voting against a resolution which it had confirmed only a day or two since. This was not a party Government. Let hon. members stand by their colors.

The motion was negatived.

MR. HENSMAN moved that the item, "Horned cattle for slaughter, £1 10s," be reduced by 10s. He should not attempt to argue the question, but simply test the feeling of the committee.

Negatived.

MR. HENSMAN moved that the item, "Sheep for slaughter, 2s. 6d.," be reduced by 1s., and item "Pigs, 4s.," be reduced by 2s.

Negatived.

MR. HENSMAN moved that item, "Bran and Pollard, £1," be reduced by 10s.

Negatived.

MR. HENSMAN moved that item, "Wheat, 6d.," be reduced by 2d.

Committee divided—

|      |     |     |     |    |
|------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Ayes | ... | ... | ... | 9  |
| Noes | ... | ... | ... | 14 |

Majority against ... 5

| AYES.                 | NOES.              |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Captain Fawcett       | Mr. H. Brockman    |
| Mr. Keane             | Mr. E. B. Brockman |
| Mr. Marmion           | Mr. Congdon        |
| Mr. McRae             | Mr. A. Forrest     |
| Mr. Parker            | Mr. Layman         |
| Mr. Richardson        | Mr. Leake          |
| Mr. Sholl             | Mr. Morrison       |
| Mr. Venn              | Mr. Pearse         |
| Mr. Hensman (Teller.) | Mr. Randall        |
|                       | Mr. Scott          |
|                       | Mr. Shenton        |
|                       | Hon. C. N. Warton  |
|                       | Hon. J. A. Wright  |
|                       | Hon. Sir M. Fraser |
|                       | (Teller.)          |

MR. HENSMAN moved that item, "Onions, £1," be reduced by 10s.

Negatived.

MR. HENSMAN moved that item, "Potatoes, £1," be reduced by 10s.

Committee divided—

|      |     |     |     |    |
|------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Ayes | ... | ... | ... | 6  |
| Noes | ... | ... | ... | 17 |

Majority against ... 11

| AYES.                 | NOES.              |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Mr. Keane             | Mr. H. Brockman    |
| Mr. McRae             | Mr. E. B. Brockman |
| Mr. Richardson        | Mr. Congdon        |
| Mr. Scott             | Captain Fawcett    |
| Mr. Sholl             | Mr. A. Forrest     |
| Mr. Hensman (Teller.) | Mr. Layman         |
|                       | Mr. Leake          |
|                       | Mr. Marmion        |
|                       | Mr. Morrison       |
|                       | Mr. Parker         |
|                       | Mr. Pearse         |
|                       | Mr. Randall        |
|                       | Mr. Shenton        |
|                       | Mr. Venn           |
|                       | Hon. C. N. Warton  |
|                       | Hon. J. A. Wright  |
|                       | Hon. Sir M. Fraser |
|                       | (Teller.)          |

MR. SHENTON moved that item, "Wine, Sparkling, 10s.," be reduced by 4s. This would bring it back to the present duty. When the division upon this item took place the other day there was an idea amongst some hon. members that sparkling wine was to be regarded as an article of luxury only, whereas, as a matter of fact, it was largely used for medicinal purposes.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) hoped the hon. member would not divide the committee, regard being had to the conclusion arrived at the other day by the very same committee. It reminded one of the appeal from Cæsar drunk to Cæsar sober.

MR. SHENTON: There was no champagne in those days.

MR. MARMION believed the increase of 4s. placed on sparkling wine the other day, on the motion of the hon. member for Kimberley, was done on the spur of the moment, and he was sure the hon. member himself never seriously intended it.

Committee divided—

|      |     |     |     |    |
|------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Ayes | ... | ... | ... | 11 |
| Noes | ... | ... | ... | 13 |

Majority against ... 2

| AYES.                 | NOES.                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Mr. Congdon           | Mr. H. Brockman          |
| Captain Fawcett       | Mr. E. B. Brockman       |
| Mr. Hensman           | Mr. A. Forrest           |
| Mr. Marmion           | Hon. Sir M. Fraser       |
| Mr. Parker            | Mr. Keane                |
| Mr. Pearse            | Mr. Layman               |
| Mr. Randall           | Mr. Leake                |
| Mr. Scott             | Mr. McRae                |
| Mr. Sholl             | Mr. Morrison             |
| Hon. J. G. Lee-Steers | Mr. Richardson           |
| Mr. Shenton (Teller.) | Mr. Venn                 |
|                       | Hon. C. N. Warton        |
|                       | Hon. J. Wright (Teller.) |

MR. SHENTON moved that the item be reduced by 3s.

Committee divided—

Ayes ... .. 10

Noes ... .. 14

Majority against ... 4

AYES.  
Mr. Congdon  
Captain Fawcett  
Mr. Hensman  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Pearse  
Mr. Randall  
Mr. Scott  
Mr. Sholl  
Hon. J. G. Lee-Steere  
Mr. Shenton (Teller.)

NOES.  
Mr. H. Brockman  
Mr. E. R. Brockman  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Hon. Sir M. Fraser  
Mr. Keane  
Mr. Layman  
Mr. Leake  
Mr. McRae  
Mr. Morrison  
Mr. Parker  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. Venn  
Hon. C. N. Warton  
Hon. J. A. Wright  
(Teller.)

MR. SHENTON moved that the item be reduced by 2s. 6d. This would bring it down to 7s. 6d., which would be 2s. 6d. more than the duty on all other wines.

MR. MARMION hoped this would commend itself even to the hon. member for Kimberley. Whether sparkling wine was a necessity or a luxury, he thought the difference in the duty between sparkling and non-sparkling wines, as originally proposed by the Commission, namely, a shilling a gallon—sparkling, 6s., and non-sparkling, 5s.—was insufficient; but he thought the difference in the duty as now suggested (2s. 6d.) ought to commend itself to the majority of hon. members, and he hoped the Government bench would support it.

MR. A. FORREST thought the committee should adhere to the schedules as agreed to the other night.

MR. SHOLL thought there was a medium in all things, and he hoped the Government would show a wise discretion in accepting this compromise. They had heard a great deal from the hon. member for Kimberley, in the course of the discussion upon these schedules, about the "poor man." The hon. member cared as much for the "poor man" as he did; and if the hon. member could get a penny out of the "poor man's" pocket he would do so.

Committee divided—

Ayes ... .. 15

Noes ... .. 9

Majority for ... 6

AYES.  
Mr. Congdon  
Captain Fawcett  
Hon. Sir M. Fraser  
Mr. Hensman  
Mr. Leake  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Parker  
Mr. Pearse  
Mr. Randall  
Mr. Scott  
Mr. Sholl  
Hon. J. G. Lee-Steere  
Hon. C. N. Warton  
Hon. J. A. Wright  
Mr. Shenton (Teller.)

NOES.  
Mr. H. Brockman  
Mr. E. R. Brockman  
Mr. Keane  
Mr. Layman  
Mr. McRae  
Mr. Morrison  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. A. Forrest (Teller.)

The motion to reduce the item by 2s. 6d. was therefore agreed to.

First schedule, as amended, put and passed.

## SECOND SCHEDULE:

(20 per cent.)

MR. MCRAE moved that the item "Carriages, carts, and wagons" be struck out of the schedule. This was a very important item for the Northern people, who had to import all their vehicles, the local make not giving satisfaction.

MR. MARMION thought that this industry—the manufacturing of carts and wagons—was one which ought certainly to be encouraged, looking at the splendid timber we possessed suitable for the purpose.

Motion negatived.

MR. E. R. BROCKMAN moved that the item "Cordials not spirituous" be struck out.

Negatived.

MR. RICHARDSON said he knew from his own experience that local saddlers at present could compete with foreign competition, with the existing duty of 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*, and he saw no necessity for increasing the duty upon harness and saddlery to 20 per cent. as was now proposed. Therefore he would move that the item "Harness and Saddlery" be struck out of the schedule.

Negatived.

Second schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Third, Fourth, and Fifth Schedules:

Agreed to, as printed.

Preamble and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) moved that the standing orders be suspended, and the bill pass through its remaining stage that evening.

MR. HENSMAN: What reason is there why we should rush the bill through

the House to-night? Why should we conduct our legislation at such railway speed? Why should we not meet again to-morrow? There are other bills yet remaining on the Notice Paper. I suppose the Australasian Naval Defence Bill is a bill that requires a considerable amount of consideration, and also the Goldfields Bill. Or is it the intention of the Government to withdraw these two bills and finish the business this evening? If not, why press this Tariff Bill upon the House to-night?

MR. PARKER said it was always the custom, he believed, to pass Tariff Acts through all their stages without delay. It was obviously a very good policy, when a new tariff was introduced, so that some importers might not gain an advantage over others.

The motion to suspend the standing orders was agreed to.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) moved that the bill be read a third time.

Agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

#### GOLDFIELDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1888.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser), with leave, without notice, moved the first reading of a bill to amend the Goldfields Act, 1886.

Agreed to.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said he proposed now to move the second reading of the bill. It was simply to enable the Government to deal with recent auriferous discoveries, and to give discoverers greater security in respect of any auriferous lands they might find, and to restrain the application for the reward offered by the Government, confining it to the first discoverer in one and the same district. The present Act allowed an unlimited number of discoverers, in any district, to set up a claim. He was sure that every hon. member would be in accord with the objects of the bill.

THE SPEAKER said he was inclined to think that the hon. gentleman would have to move the suspension of the standing orders before he could proceed any further with the bill that evening. Although the Government had a right to

introduce a bill without leave or notice, he thought they had no right to move the second reading, without leave or notice, on the same day. He thought, according to their rules, this could not be done without suspending the standing orders.

MR. HENSMAN: I move that the House do now adjourn. A more strange proceeding than that proposed by the Government I never heard of. Here we are at half-past midnight, and it is proposed to suspend the standing orders to admit of the passage of yet another important bill through all its stages. Has the Government stated any cause of urgency? Why at this sitting? Are we not here to try and understand all matters brought before us? If this is to go on, we had better have half a dozen bills brought in at once, and pass them *en bloc*. I think it is making legislation ridiculous. If any hon. members want to go away, let them go. The Government is bound to conduct the business of the colony. To suspend the standing orders at this hour! Are we mere children, or mere slaves bound to obey the voice of our masters, or are we men, sent here to do our business calmly and quietly? I think if we were to do what the Government want us to do, it would be a specimen of legislation that would make us the laughing-stock and opprobrium of the world.

MR. A. FORREST said he agreed with the hon. member for Greenough as regards hasty legislation; but he thought that in this particular case, in view of recent events, and the search which was just now going on for gold in certain localities, it was very advisable to provide, as soon as possible, that only one reward would be made, which could only be claimed by the first discoverer, so as not to have fifty applicants coming forward. Under these circumstances he was prepared to support the bill.

MR. MARMION said he would be prepared to support a fair measure, dealing with the claims of discoverers, but nothing that savored of a monopoly. He was not at all, however, prepared to say that evening what might be the tendency of the present bill. He regretted the Government did not think proper to bring it forward at an earlier stage of the session. He thought it

would be in the interests of all parties that the bill should not be hurried through that evening, without more mature consideration. It must be borne in mind that they were placing large powers in the hands of the Government, and, although he did not suppose they would act injudiciously, he thought it would be wise and certainly politic that they should have some little more time for the consideration of the bill. It appeared to him they were liable to make themselves a laughing-stock to those who sent them there to represent them, and he, for one, would not consent to make himself the laughing-stock of his constituents, even if he put the Government to inconvenience.

Mr. PARKER said that, as a rule, he thought it advisable they should abide by their standing orders, except in exceptional cases, such as that of passing a Tariff Act, or some case of pressing necessity. But he could not see that there were any circumstances which would justify them in passing the present bill through all its stages that evening. If it was a bill of importance, that was the very reason why they should not suspend the standing orders, but take time to give it due consideration. On the other hand, if it was a bill of no great importance, there was no necessity for departing from the usual course of procedure with regard to it. It was a bill to amend a very lengthy Act, and embodying perhaps some very important changes. The 11th section, he noticed, would enable a lease to be granted at any time after the discovery of a goldfield, whereas at present no lease could be granted until the expiration of two years after a goldfield had been proclaimed. Were they now suddenly, at a moment's notice, to repeal this provision? He thought they would be unworthy of the confidence of their constituents if they passed such a bill as this through all its stages at one sitting. Then again as to the proposed reward for the discovery of a goldfield. He could not agree that the colony was liable to anything in the shape of a reward excepting the £1,000 already offered by the Government, and only upon such conditions as the Governor-in-Council might declare. As the House would meet again in March, it would be time enough surely to consider this bill

then. At any rate he objected to the suspension of the standing orders with the view of passing the bill through the House that evening. He presumed the bill had been brought in mainly to enable the Government to deal with the Yilgarn goldfields; but he might point out there was not much likelihood of any discoveries being made in that neighborhood within the next six months, in consequence of the dry weather and the state of the country.

Mr. RICHARDSON said that notwithstanding the absence of water he was informed there were several parties prepared to go out, and two or three months might make a great difference to the colony. He hoped the bill would be allowed to pass before they separated this session.

Mr. SHOLL said he was not in favor of shelving this bill until March. He thought it was most important that this bill should pass and become law as soon as possible. He would prefer even agreeing to the suspension of the standing orders to seeing the bill postponed until next session. He thought the Government might very well have placed the bill before them at an earlier stage.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said the Government had brought in the bill in the public interests, to provide certain amendments in the principal Act to which their attention had been called by a select committee of the House last session as desirable. He had no wish to press the bill upon the House that evening. He would move that the second reading be taken on Friday next.

Agreed to.

#### APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SPEAKER.

THE SPEAKER said as he had been summoned to attend the Federal Council, which met at Hobart on the 16th inst., he must ask the House to excuse him during the remainder of the session, as he should have to go away on Friday. He therefore thought it would be well that hon. members should now appoint someone to act in his absence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser): I have pleasure in moving that Sir Thomas Cockburn-Campbell, the Chairman of Committees, do take the Chair, during the unavoidable

able absence of the Speaker from the colony.

MR. PARKER: I have much pleasure in seconding it.

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

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

*Friday, 6th January, 1833.*

Intercolonial Postal Conference—Goldfields Act Amendment Bill, 1833: second reading; committed; third reading—Message (No. 4): Assenting to Bills—Australian Naval Force Bill: second reading; committed; third reading—Victoria Public Library Bill (lapsed)—Governors of High School—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at noon.

PRAYERS.

### INTERCOLONIAL POSTAL CONFERENCE.

MR. PARKER, with leave, without notice, asked the Colonial Secretary whether an Intercolonial Postal Conference was to be held at Sydney on the 19th inst., and, if so, whether an invitation had been given to this colony to send a representative to the Conference?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said that a Postal Conference was to be held at Sydney this month, and an invitation had been given to this colony to send a representative. The Government had considered the matter; and as it was found it would not be convenient that the Postmaster General (Mr. Gahan) should attend, the South Australian Government had been asked to allow the Postmaster General of that colony (Hon. J. S. Johnson) to represent Western Australia at the Conference. The South Australian Government, with their usual courtesy, had consented. He might add that the Postmaster General (Mr. Gahan) had made an offer to the Government, expressing his readiness to defray his own expenses,

if it was thought it might be convenient he should attend. The arrangement, however, stood as he had already informed the hon. member, and this colony would be represented at the Conference by the Postmaster General of South Australia.

### GOLDFIELDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1833.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser), in moving the second reading of this bill, said it would be in the recollection of hon. members that at the last session of Council a select committee was appointed to consider certain amendments suggested in the Goldfields Regulations by the late Mr. Hardman, in a letter addressed by that gentleman to the Government. The committee recommended that the 11th section of the Act should be materially altered, in order to give that impetus necessary to quartz reefing at Kimberley which the committee believed to be essential to the prosperity of the goldfields. That section provided, among other things, that no mining lease could be granted until the expiration of two years after a goldfield had been proclaimed. The committee recommended that leases should be granted at any time after a goldfield had been declared. The committee also recommended that provision should be made for separate rewards for gold discoveries being made only when a new goldfield had been discovered in another division of the colony, other than that in which a goldfield already existed. They also recommended certain modifications as regards the working hours and labor clauses. A few days after the committee brought up their report the Government received a report from the Warden at Kimberley on the subject of the regulations, from which it appeared that the regulations then existing were well adapted to the Kimberley goldfields. The Warden was satisfied with them, and he did not recommend their amendment. That being so, the Government, last session, did not think it advisable to proceed with the report of the select committee, and the matter was postponed. Since then, however, the colony had very much changed. At that time Kimberley was the only place in this colony where the existence of the precious metal in workable