

at the present moment, how would it affect the people of the colony? We know that these properties would not realise the amounts advanced on them, and the properties would fall into the hands of the mortgagees. The provisions of this Bill really contemplate nothing more than the granting of the same rights to institutions that have made advances upon the security of leasehold or personal properties as are now enjoyed by those that have made advances upon the security of freehold properties.

MR. RICHARDSON: I can quite understand that such a Bill as this, in the hands of the highly-respected financial institutions we have at present in our midst, might work very well, and do no harm; but what occurs to me is, what would be the result of placing such a power as this Bill contemplates, in the hands of an entirely different class of institutions, who might be inclined to take undue advantage of those who were unfortunate enough to get into their clutches. That is where the danger comes in.

MR. CANNING: I do not attach very great importance to this measure myself, but I should like to point out this: it is not a measure wholly in the interests of financial institutions, but also in the interests of a very large section of the people of this colony. If these institutions find they have advanced money to a man who turns out to be unfit to manage his property, or who is spending money recklessly, in what position do they find themselves now? They find that they are likely to be saddled with that property for an indefinite time, after attempting in vain to dispose of it; and they are likely to be very chary in making other advances. The object of these institutions is not to become owners of property, but to invest money, and within a reasonable time to get their capital back again. I do not know that any institutions are likely to be organised that would seek to become owners of property in such a roundabout way as has been suggested this evening. They would take more direct means to obtain property, by purchasing it at once. If these institutions find themselves in the position which we were told they were in, under the present law, we may depend upon it they will take care in future to confine their operations to freehold

property, and will be very chary in making any advances upon leaseholds. I do not know whether that would be a good thing for the colony. Why this distinction should be made as regards freehold property, I am not able to understand. I should imagine that the owner of leasehold property, if mortgaged to a Bank or any large financial institution of repute, would be in a much safer and better position than if he found himself in the hands of a private individual.

Amendment put and carried, on the voices.

Bill thrown out.

BANKRUPTCY RETURNS.

MR. A. FORREST, in accordance with notice, moved that a return be laid on the table of the House showing the costs incurred up to the present, in the Bankruptcy Court, in the estates of H. S. Ranford and Charles Cutbush.

Put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 20 minutes past 6 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 20th September, 1893.

Additional Estimates: Message from the Governor—
Tariff Bill: Recommendations of the Commission—
Tariff Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4:30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE.

A Message was received from His Excellency the Governor, transmitting additional Estimates of Expenditure for 1893-4, amounting to £3,560 6s. 6d.

TARIFF BILL.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

On the Order of the Day for going into committee on the Tariff Bill,

MR. HARPER, in accordance with notice, moved, "That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the recommendations contained in the Report of the Commission on the Tariff should be adopted with respect to the following articles, viz.:—Ales and Beer (imported and colonial), Malting Barley, Fruit, (green), Books, Printing Paper, Immigrants' Baggage and Effects, and Uniforms and Apparel for Defence Forces." The hon. member said that being desirous that the recommendations of the Commission—increasing the duties upon these articles—should be adhered to, and, as he could not in committee of the House move to raise the duties, he had brought forward this resolution in its present form as the only way of giving expression to his desire, and of affording members an opportunity of expressing their views upon the subject. He had no wish to make any remarks himself.

MR. RICHARDSON, in seconding the resolution, said he had no wish to go over the debate on the tariff again; still, perhaps a few remarks upon the general subject might not be out of place, as he thought some member of the Commission should shortly reply to some of the remarks and criticisms that had been made in the course of the debate on the second reading of the Bill. Having spoken early in that debate, before these criticisms were made, he thought perhaps he might be justified at this stage in replying to them. He wished emphatically to take the strongest objection indeed to the nature and tenour of some of the remarks made with reference to the action of the members of the Commission. Statements of the most personal, and he might say impertinent, character had been made by some hon. members with reference to the action of the Commission. First of all, they had the hon. member for West Kimberley saying he could look down the list and see the personal interests of the various members of the Commission sticking out in the most transparent manner; yet in the very next breath the hon. member, with an eye to his own interests, said it was quite evident there was no one connected with the timber industry on

the Commission, otherwise that industry would have been better protected, and that if he himself had been on the Commission he would have taken care that it was better protected. The hon. member, it appeared, was quite capable of keeping a very sharp eye upon his own personal interests. Then there was the hon. member for the Gascoyne, who made some attempt to explain away the duties put on some articles and removed off other articles, especially as regard bran and pollard, and flour. The hon. member's nice way of putting it was, that as the members of the Commission were interested in flour they put a duty on it, but not upon bran and pollard. To show that there was not the slightest foundation for such a statement, he might mention that, with one exception, there was not a member on that Commission connected in any shape or way with the growth of flour or bran. With reference to bran, some very nasty things were said—levelled, I suppose, at the chairman of the Commission, because he went largely into the dairying business—but utterly uncalled for, because the chairman did not use bran, however much he might be interested in the dairying industry. With the exception of the chairman, no other member of the Commission was in any way interested in dairy products. As a matter of fact, the object in lessening the duty on bran had a great deal more to do with town interests than country interests. Dairymen in the country districts, where there was plenty of bush feed, used very little bran or pollard; but in the towns, every individual who kept cows used bran.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): What about hay and chaff? Don't they use hay and chaff, too?

MR. RICHARDSON said no doubt they did. But, so far as reducing the duty on bran was concerned, it was not done, as had been insinuated, in the interests of any member of the Commission, but in the interests of those who kept milch cows in towns. Then there was the Stock Tax. The Commission left that untouched, although the members were more interested in stock than in agriculture. He might say, in passing, that if they had paid much heed to a great deal of pressure brought to bear upon

them by certain other members of that House, probably they would have increased the duty on livestock very considerably; and, probably, if some other members of the House had been on the Commission they would have done all they could to increase that duty. But the Commission withstood all the pressure brought to bear upon them to increase the tax upon stock, though that was really the only thing they could be accused of being directly interested in, excepting, perhaps, wool bales. Although most people had, at some time or other, had their moments of self-reproach, he could say this: whatever feelings of that kind had ever troubled him, he had never yet sunk so low that he could be bought by such a paltry consideration as a slight reduction in the duty on wool bales. The reduction would only have amounted to 16s. 8d. in 100 bales, and to insinuate that their integrity and sense of honour had sunk so utterly low that they could be bought for 16s. 8d. was, he thought, a most unwarrantable and wholly unjustifiable reflection upon the members of the Commission, and branded them as men totally unfit to sit upon any Commission or to have anything to do with public affairs.

MR. CLARKSON: Is the hon. member in order?

MR. RICHARDSON: I am making a personal explanation.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is not out of order.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The hon. member has had his opportunity of making a personal explanation. He is now going through the whole tariff again.

MR. RICHARDSON, continuing, said that the hon. member for West Kimberley had attributed the basest motives to the members of this Commission. [Cries of "No, no."] The hon. member said that the personal interests of the members could be seen sticking out of their report everywhere. He simply wished to refute that accusation. When he saw men so ready to attribute self-interest to others, he generally tried to keep his eye upon those men. When they were so glib in accusing others of looking after Number One, he began to suspect that they were in the habit of playing that little game themselves. So far as the actions of this

Tariff Commission went, he was able to say that the members of it were found frequently voting, in the divisions that took place, directly against their own personal interests; and he repudiated with scorn the imputations to the contrary. As for the insinuation that their worthy chairman had been influenced by such a paltry motive as the reduction of a few shillings a ton on bran, he thought that such an imputation was beneath contempt. Coming to the resolution now before them, he thought it was a pity that the Government did not more seriously consider the recommendations of the Commission with regard to some of these articles, and more especially ale and beer. It had been said that in reducing the duty on sugar they would be causing a loss to the revenue of £4,000 or £5,000; but the Commission calculated upon receiving £5,000 or £6,000 from an Excise duty on colonial beer. He thought they were justified in calculating upon that amount, in view of the increased output of the colonial article resulting from the increased duty on imported beer. Therefore they had good ground for reducing the duties upon the necessities of life, which they did to a large extent, and more especially in the case of the family man. If the recommendations of the Commission had been agreed to, the cost of living in this colony would have been very much cheaper. The hon. member for the Swan, referring to apparel and slops, said they had imposed a heavy burden on the poorer classes by putting an extra duty of 2½ per cent. on slops; but the hon. member had no eyes to see the reductions—amounting to from 5 to 20 per cent.—which the Commission recommended on other articles of household necessity. If the Government succeeded, in committee, in replacing sugar and tea on the old list, he should only be too happy to move, himself, to reduce the duty on apparel and slops to 10 per cent. [MR. LORON: I will support you in that.] If all the proposals of the Government with regard to increasing the duties were agreed to, all round, the public would be mulcted to the extent of about £30,000, and they would have a largely increased revenue. [THE PREMIER: We want it, too.] If the Government said they wanted additional taxation, that altered the position altogether. He thought the Premier made

it rather a boast that they had been able to carry on their public works policy without resorting to any increased taxation. [THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: Hitherto.] This announcement of the Premier that they wanted additional revenue came upon them in a new light altogether. The Commission's instructions were simply not to reduce the revenue, to preserve the revenue; they were never led to understand that they were expected to increase the revenue. Of course, if the Government now said they wanted all the revenue they could get from these increases, he had nothing further to say. But he objected to their obtaining it under false colours. To provide for an additional revenue by manipulating the Tariff, and in the same breath to say they were not increasing taxation, was altogether beyond his comprehension.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said he did not wish in any way to attempt to answer the remarks of the hon. member for the DeGrey, but it seemed to him that they were altogether outside the motion now before the House. The only item the hon. member had referred to which was included in the resolution of the hon. member for Beverley was ale and beer. The hon. member went off at a tangent to other matters not included in this motion at all. He ventured to submit that the hon. member had utterly failed to justify the action of the Commission as regards the other items. He had no wish to follow the hon. member into personal matters; he thought the less they had to do with personalities in dealing with this tariff question the better. [MR. RICHARDSON: Who started it?] He did not know who started it. Whoever started it, he thought they had better have no more of it. He had always endeavoured to avoid it, himself, and he thought members might do well to follow his example. He would suggest that they should deal with all these items in committee, and not upon this motion.

MR. HARPER: We cannot raise the duties in committee. This is the only way we can deal with the matter.

MR. DEHAMEL said he was glad the hon. member had brought forward this motion, if only for the reason that it had shown them that the boast of the Government that they were able to carry out

their public works policy without resorting to extra taxation was a fictitious boast. [THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: Hitherto.] The hon. gentleman said hitherto. The public now would be able to see what had been the effect of the great loan policy of the Government. If there had been no necessity for extra taxation hitherto, it appeared they had need for increased taxation now and in the future. That was practically the effect of the admission made by the Premier.

THE SPEAKER: I think it would be well if hon. members confined themselves to the resolution before the House, and the particular items mentioned in it.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he certainly could not support the motion, so far as it proposed to raise the duty on imported ale and beer. He intended, when in committee, to move to reduce the duty, rather than increase it. With regard to malting barley, he agreed with the Government that we should leave the duty as low as possible upon all raw materials. That was the principle he intended to act upon, all through this tariff. As to printing paper, another item mentioned in the resolution, he did not see why printing paper should be allowed to come in free, and he agreed with the Commission in that. He did not see why newspapers, which, after all, were simply commercial speculations, should not pay a fair duty upon the material they used, as well as other industries. As to uniforms and apparel, if the Government could obtain these uniforms in the colony, and as good an article as the imported article, well and good; but, if not, he thought the Government had a perfect right to import them. Speaking generally, he might say that there were some items included in the resolution which he could support, and there were others which he could not. He might say, however, that on the whole he much preferred this resolution to the Message sent down to the House yesterday by the Governor, proposing some further changes in the tariff. It seemed to him that the Government did not know their own minds as to what kind of tariff they wanted. He thought it was a pity they did not adhere to their original proposals, instead of causing greater confusion by the Message they sent down yesterday.

MR. LEFROY said it appeared to him it would save a great deal of time if they were to discuss these items in committee. He could quite understand the anxiety of the members of the Commission to have their recommendations adopted, as far as possible. He presumed the House could adopt some means for increasing these duties without dealing with them in this particular resolution.

THE SPEAKER: There seems to be some misapprehension in the minds of members as to what the effect of this resolution would be if agreed to. It is contrary to our Standing Orders for any private member to propose any increases in Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means; therefore, any member wishing to increase any duty upon any item in the tariff could not do so when the House goes into committee on the Bill. Nor can they do so by this resolution, for no tax or impost can be initiated or imposed by the House itself. The resolution, if adopted, would simply be an indication to the Government of the feeling of the House, or of a majority of the House, with regard to these particular items. It would be for the Government to consider whether they would recommend His Excellency the Governor to send down a Message to increase the duties according to the wish of the majority. They need not do so unless they like; and this House itself, as I have said, cannot move a resolution asking the Government to increase any duties; and I think very properly so, because the Government are responsible for the revenue and the finances, and for the administration of the colony.

MR. LÖTON said with regard to the recommendation of the Commission as to increasing the duty on imported beer, he was in favour of increasing the present duty; but he did not say that he agreed as to the amount of the increase proposed by the Commission. While he was in favour of raising this duty, he would at the same time be in favour of imposing an Excise duty on colonial beer. The Commission recommended an increase of 50 per cent., or 6d. a gallon, on imported beer in wood, equal to 25s. a hogshead. He thought this was excessive, and would seriously interfere with the importation of English beer, if not prohibit it altogether, which would mean a loss to the

revenue of about £12,500, calculated upon last year's duty. The Commission, however, recommended an Excise duty of 3d. a gallon, or 12s. 6d. a hogshead, on colonial beer, which it was calculated would yield, according to the present output, about £2,500. Of course, if the imported article were shut out of the market there would naturally be an increase in the consumption of the colonial-made article. But would an Excise duty in any way make up the deficiency, if the imported article were excluded, or excluded to any material extent? He thought not. He thought there would be a large deficiency in the revenue. There was another point: if this excessive duty were put on at once, without any notice, the question arose whether the local producers were in a position, straightway, to meet the requirements of the public? If the Commission had recommended a duty of 1s. 3d. on imported beer, and 3d. (or even 2d.) Excise duty on colonial beer, he would have been entirely with them. But he was not with them in the recommendation they had made. Nor was he with the Government on this question, when they proposed to increase the duty on English beer, without at the same time levying an Excise duty on the local article. He did not see at all why these local brewers should be protected to this extent, unless they contributed something to the revenue in return.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that when he read this motion, and considered it for a while, he came to the conclusion that, with the exception of ale and beer, the other items were very unimportant, as revenue-producing items at any rate. Green fruit, for instance: whether the duty was $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb., as recommended by the Commission, or 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, as proposed by the Government, could not make much difference to the revenue. But he thought it would be more convenient to have an *ad valorem* duty than a specific duty. As to books, some £8,000 or £9,000 worth came into the colony last year, when they were admitted free; and if they were to put a duty of 5 per cent. on them it would probably make a difference of not more than about £300 to the revenue. Printing paper again: the recommendation of the Commission to put printing paper on the 5 per cent. list would not make a difference

of more than £200 a year to the revenue. With regard to immigrants' baggage, they could not very well estimate what the difference would be, but it could not be much. With regard to uniforms, he did not care much on which Schedule they appeared, because, so far as the Government were concerned, they would come in free; and he had no objection to that item being dealt with as proposed by the Commission. The only important item, in fact, mentioned in the resolution was imported beer. He believed that the revenue received from this item, including both wood and bottle, amounted to something like £18,000; and the additional duty proposed by the Government would produce a considerable amount extra—some £5,000 a year, calculated upon the quantity now imported. He could not understand the argument of the hon. member for the Swan that he was opposed to the local brewers making so much profit. So far as the Government were concerned, they did not object to the brewers making some profit, so long as the Government received this additional revenue from the imported article. He did not believe that any of our local brewers were making fortunes at the present time; at least he never heard of it. He did not really see that it was much use for the hon. member to press his motion to a division; he did not think that a majority of members would be prepared to accept it *en bloc*. If each item were taken separately, and on its own merits, he could understand it; but he did not think members would be prepared to deal with all these items in this general way. It was a left-handed way of dealing with the subject, and—he said so with all respect to His Honour the Speaker—he questioned whether it was even constitutional. It seemed to him it was the duty of the Government to bring down to that House, by Message from the Governor, all matters connected with the taxation of the people; and the only object of this resolution must be to bring pressure to bear upon the Government to do something which they were unwilling to do without pressure. If the House were not satisfied with the Ministry and their proposals, members had every opportunity of replacing them by a Ministry with whom they would be satisfied. He thought he had gone further than any other Ministry

probably would have gone when he informed the House that if a strong opinion was expressed in committee on any particular item, as regards increasing the duty on it, the Government would consider the matter. But he thought that this way of dealing with the matter was unprecedented. Personally, he had no very strong views on any of these items. The reason why the Government did not adhere to the recommendation of the Commission, as regards ale and beer, was because they thought they went too far; and he thought the proposals of the Government went as far as was reasonable. He thought the hon. member, under the circumstances, might withdraw his resolution, and let them deal with the items in committee. They could ascertain the views of members in committee just as well as by passing this resolution, and better.

Mr. MONGER said it appeared to him there was very little in the motion, after all. It seemed to have been brought forward to test the opinion of the House as to whether the recommendations of the Commission or the proposals of the Government should be adopted. With the exception of ale and beer, the items were so unimportant that he was surprised the hon. member should have brought them under their notice at all in this way. Personally he would have liked to have seen an extra duty on imported beer, and an excise duty on the local article. As to malting barley, he supposed the object in increasing the duty was to encourage local production; but, so far, there had been very little attempt made at producing it. The other items were really of so little importance, from a revenue-producing point of view, that he was surprised that the hon. member should have thought it worth while to have raised a debate upon them. After all, if the resolution were agreed to, it would rest with the Government whether they would recommend the Governor to send down a Message, to increase these duties. They had the Premier's assurance that the Government would be prepared to consider any item upon which there was a strong expression of opinion in committee; and he thought they might be content with that assurance.

Mr. HARPER said he was surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for York in opposing the motion. He ventured to

say that if the Government had fallen in with the recommendation of the Commission as regards the duty on flour, the hon. member would have been quite prepared to have supported the position taken up by the Commission as regards these other articles. He had no particular wish to press his motion. He only thought that members might desire to express their views on the subject, as regards these increases. He thought he would give them an opportunity of saying whether the views of the representatives of the people or of the Government should prevail. It was a matter of no moment to him, personally, whether the view of the Commission were carried out or not; only he thought that members should have an opportunity of expressing a definite opinion upon the point, as these increases could not be dealt with in committee.

Motion put and negatived.

The House then went into committee on the Bill.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4:

Put and passed.

FIRST SCHEDULE (SPECIFIC DUTIES):

Item—"Ale, Beer, and Stout, in wood, per gallon 1s. 3d.":

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved that the rate of duty be reduced by 3d. This would make it the same as at present, and he proposed it for this reason: our brewers required no protection at all.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We want revenue.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said if the Government wanted more revenue, let them make it on something else. He did not see why any consumer who preferred English beer to the colonial should have to pay 3d. a gallon more for it, simply to protect our local brewers, who were sufficiently prosperous, according to the evidence given by some of them before the Commission.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he really could not understand the hon. member's argument. The hon. member, apparently, was afraid that somebody would get a little profit if this duty were increased, and, for that reason, he would deprive the public revenue of a considerable source of increase—probably £2,000. There were a great many reductions in this new tariff, and it would have to be made up in some way. If the hon. mem-

ber could show him that we would get as much revenue from the new tariff as from the old one, and still make these reductions, he could understand why he should propose to reduce this duty on imported beer. If not, then the hon. member was not justified in moving to reduce the duty. He estimated that these two items—beer in the hogshead and beer in bottle—would produce about £5,000 a year extra with the additional duty, and if the hon. member knocked that off it would be the duty of the Government to consider the position, and propose some other duties in lieu of it. Some members had twitted him with trying to obtain additional revenue by a side wind. The Government never asked for this Commission; they would have been quite satisfied to have carried on their public works policy with the revenue they were receiving under the old tariff. They never pressed the House to have a Commission appointed; on the contrary, they avoided it as much as they could, but it was forced upon them. Members seemed to think that the Government could not arrange the tariff themselves, and they insisted upon a Commission, so the Government appointed a Commission, and they had adopted the views of that Commission as far as they could. The question of an Excise duty was altogether a different matter; that could be dealt with at any time. The mere passing of this Bill and the adoption of this new tariff would not preclude the Government from imposing an Excise duty at any time. It might be desirable—he would make no promise about that—but it might be desirable hereafter to place an Excise duty on beer, but they did not want to do everything at once. The mere passing of this item would not in any way prevent the Parliament of the country from dealing with the question of an Excise duty at any time it thought necessary.

MR. LOTON said he would support the amendment. The Premier said that with the proposed increase on beer in bottle and in bulk, he expected an increased revenue of about £5,000 a year, or £2,000 from beer in wood alone. He did not think the Premier's expectations would be realised if this extra duty were imposed, because when you increased duties beyond a certain point they became practically prohibitive, to a certain ex-

tent, and decreased the quantity imported. It would be the same with imported beer.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I will take my chance about that.

MR. LOTON said that if they increased the duty 50 per cent., and there was a reduction of 50 per cent. in the quantity imported, the revenue would gain nothing. Unless the Government were prepared to agree to an Excise duty, he could not consent to give any further protection to the local brewers than they already had. The increased duty on malt, to which reference had been made, would not produce more than about 4d. a hogshead extra revenue from the local brewers. He must oppose this additional duty on beer.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): How are you going to make it up?

MR. LOTON said they had not taken anything off yet, nor was it proposed to take anything off the present duty, so that there was really nothing to make up.

MR. A. FORREST said some members seemed to think that the local breweries were making fortunes. For the last seven years he had had £3,000 invested in one of these breweries, and he had never received sixpence benefit from it. He thought they were only doing what was fair and just to this local industry by increasing the duty on the imported article. Why should they begrudge the local brewers a little more profit, if at the same time they could increase the revenue to the extent of some thousands of pounds? People need not drink beer unless they liked. He thought it was the duty of that House to protect our own people, and not outsiders. Those who drank English beer could well afford an extra 3d. a gallon.

MR. MONGER said the hon. member for the Swan had argued that if they imposed too high a duty it became prohibitive, and diminished the quantity imported; but he would remind the hon. member that, as a rule, English beer was not sent out here to the order of the merchant, but on behalf of the brewer or exporter in England; and, no matter what the duty might be, these bottlers and exporters would continue to send as much English beer to the colony as they could find a market for, and would always try to compete with the local

article. They were not going to lose a good market for the sake of a few pence extra duty.

MR. CLARKSON thought the amendment was only one of the hon. member for Gascoyne's jokes. The hon. member must know that we must have revenue from somewhere; and what fairer or more legitimate way of getting it could there be than by imposing a duty on a luxury like beer? People need not drink English beer unless they liked to do so; it could not be said that it was one of the necessities of life. This extra duty of 3d. a gallon would not increase the price of the "poor man's" beer one iota. Besides that, we made very good beer in the colony now, and every encouragement should be given to all local industries.

MR. RICHARDSON said he would offer a suggestion, by way of a compromise. Seeing the very divided opinion of the House on this subject, he would suggest that the Government should compromise the matter by letting the duty on beer in the wood remain as at present, and raise the duty on the bottled stuff. He was afraid that if they put too high a duty on imported beer in bulk, they would simply play into the hands of the local brewers without benefiting the revenue in any way, because there could be no doubt that a high duty would affect the quantity imported. It would be a different thing, if the Government were willing to impose an Excise duty on the colonial article, to counterbalance the effect of the increased duty on the imported stuff.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We can put on an Excise duty next year, as well as now.

MR. RICHARDSON said that Excise duty loomed a long way off, and he strongly recommended the Government to adopt his suggestion, to let the present duty remain on beer in bulk, and increase the duty on bottled beer only.

MR. MOLLOY said it had been shown that these items—ale, beer, and stout, in the wood and in the bottle—contributed £18,000 to the revenue last year. That being so, it showed that the imported article was very generally consumed. Nor was the consumption confined to one class of the community. It seemed to him that £18,000 a year was a very fair contribution to the revenue from beer consumers, and he saw no reason why they

should increase it. If it was necessary to produce a larger revenue from this source, because of the proposed reductions in other directions, it seemed to him that this extra revenue should be obtained from those who were benefited. As had been pointed out, the result of a high duty on the imported article would probably be to reduce the quantity imported, and it seemed to him it was better to rely upon the revenue now received from this source than to run the risk of a diminished revenue in consequence of a smaller quantity being imported, because of the higher duty.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the hon. member for Newcastle seemed to look upon him as the joker of the House. He saw no reason for it, because he was generally very much in earnest, and never more so than in this instance. He thought he might dub the hon. member not as a joker, but as the undertaker of the House, looking at the very lugubrious manner in which he generally addressed the House. The hon. member for West Kimberley admitted that he was a large shareholder in a local brewery; that being so, he doubted whether the hon. member, being interested, ought to vote upon this item. He agreed with the hon. member for the Swan that the quantity of beer imported would be reduced if they made this duty so high as the Government proposed, because it would lead to the price to the consumer being raised, and there would be less consumed. They must remember that it was not the people of Perth alone who drank English beer; and he did not think it would be fair to tax the whole community, for the sake of benefiting two or three local breweries. Why should they compel people to drink beer that was unpalatable to them, simply in order to swell the profits of a couple of local brewing establishments?

MR. LOTON said they were told by the hon. member for West Kimberley that the local brewers wanted further protection. What was the amount of protection which they now had? They were protected to the extent of £2 10s. per hogshead—as much as the prime cost of the article they produced. Was not that sufficient protection? Were they not protected enough when they were protected to the extent of the extreme

cost of the article they produced? If not, he did not know how far the hon. member wanted to go in the way of protection.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he must remind the committee that the Commission had proposed a duty of 1s. 6d. a gallon on beer in the wood, and 2s. a gallon on bottled beer, and an Excise duty of 3d. a gallon on colonial beer. That would have been tantamount to a duty of 1s. 3d. on imported beer in bulk, and 1s. 9d. on the bottled beer. He expected the local brewers would have been just as well satisfied with the recommendations of the Commission as with the proposals of the Government. Should there be some reduction in the quantity imported, as some members anticipated, the revenue was not likely to suffer, because there would be a proportionate increase in the duty. It must also be remembered that they were raising the duty on malt from 2s. to 3s. per bushel, and also increasing the duty on malting barley from 4d. to 6d.; so that if they reduced this duty on imported beer to 1s., they would be putting the local brewers in a worse position than they were in now. He thought they had better leave the item as it stood. Possibly they might by-and-bye require a larger revenue than this new tariff would provide—it was difficult to estimate what a new tariff would yield—and they might then consider the expediency of putting an Excise duty on colonial beer. But he thought they might leave this Excise duty an open question for the present. No representations had been made to the Government from the local brewers, or from any section of the community, on the subject. He regarded this duty on imported beer simply as a revenue-producing item, though, no doubt, it would give some little assistance to the local industry. So long as the revenue benefited by it, he did not see why they should begrudge giving the local brewers a little extra encouragement.

At 6-30 the Chairman left the chair for an hour.

At 7-30 the committee resumed.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, resuming the debate on his amendment, said the Government should consider how the loss of

revenue was to be made up, if they did not accept the full recommendations of the Commission, and particularly the Excise duty on local beer as recommended. An Excise duty on the year's output of the Swan Brewery would yield a revenue of £3,375.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Excise duty should be kept as a resource in reserve.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said an Excise duty on all the breweries in the colony would yield a probable revenue of £6,700 a year, to make up any deficiency on the reduced importation of beer.

MR. DEHAMEL said he would have voted for the increased duty on imported beer, if the Government had also proposed an Excise duty on local beer. Local industries should be encouraged by allowing raw materials to come in free. He would vote against any increase in the duty on English beer.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Government anticipated that the extra duty of 3d. a gallon on beer in wood, and 6d. in bottle, would result in a less importation, but that the extra duty would make up that loss. The increased duty would be an assistance to local breweries, and would, at any rate, do no harm. The Excise duty could be held as a resource in reserve; and if, after a year's trial, more revenue was found to be necessary, an Excise duty could be imposed. He thought the proposal of the Government was a fair one.

MR. MONGER said some hon. members seemed to be under the impression that the same price was realised for colonial beer as for English beer. A few months ago, he asked one hon. member his opinion as to the price of the colonial and the imported beers, and found his idea was altogether different from the fact. The hon. member was one of those appointed on the Tariff Commission. The price of colonial beer was £4 per hogshead, and of English beer from £7 to £8; therefore in a difference of £3 to £4 per hogshead there was a large margin in favour of the colonial article. If it paid the English brewer to send beer to this colony at that price, he would continue to send it to be sold here at the same price, even if an extra duty of 12s. 6d. per hogshead were put on. It was known that certain classes would always have

English in preference to colonial beer, and even an extra penny a glass would make no difference in the consumption. There had been no reasonable argument to show why the Government proposal should not be accepted, leaving it optional to bring in an Excise duty when found necessary for revenue purposes. The extra cost of producing colonial ale, under this tariff, would be 6s. or 7s. per hogshead, as compared with 12s. 6d. more for producing an English hogshead. He hoped that those hon. members who had the interests of the people at heart would support the recommendations of the Government.

MR. LEFROY said the majority of the people were consumers, not producers. He would put duties on luxuries, and take them off necessities; therefore he would vote for the increased duty on imported beer.

MR. CLARKSON moved that the question be now put.

THE CHAIRMAN said the Standing Orders did not provide for putting the question. There was vested in the Chairman the power of exercising a sound discretion as to whether he should put the question or not, but discussion should not be stopped prematurely by putting the question. It was for the House to determine whether it would give to the Speaker or Chairman the power of putting the question when he might think fit.

MR. CLARKSON moved that the House do now divide.

MR. MONGER seconded the motion.

Motion for an immediate division put and passed.

A division on MR. SHOLL'S amendment was accordingly taken, with the following result:—

Ayes	10
Noes	15

Majority against... 5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. DeHamel	Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Cookworthy
Mr. Loton	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Molloy	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. R. F. Sholl	Mr. Marmion
Mr. H. W. Sholl	Mr. Monger
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Paterson
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Pearce
Mr. Phillips (Teller).	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Solomon
	Sir J. G. Lee Steere
	Mr. Traylen
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. Hassell (Teller).

Amendment negatived, and item passed.

MR. R. F. SHOLL asked for a ruling on the question whether it was competent for a member (Mr. A. Forrest), who had avowed himself interested in a Perth brewery to a large extent, to vote on this question.

THE CHAIRMAN said a great many hon. members were interested in the question, either as importers of ale and beer or as merchants or dealers in these articles; and if a rule of exclusion on account of self-interest were to be enforced, many of the members would be equally excluded from voting. All these matters included in the tariff affected the interests of individual members, directly or indirectly, as producers, importers, dealers, or consumers.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he had not asked for a lecture, but for a distinct ruling. [Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I must call the hon. member to order. It is extremely disrespectful in an hon. member to address the Chair in that manner, and say I have been lecturing the committee. It is from a feeling that consideration is due to hon. members as a whole that I made the explanation as to the grounds of my ruling, otherwise I might have confined myself to giving a very curt reply. It is from a feeling of the respect due to the committee that I entered into the explanation which the hon. member is pleased to call a lecture.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I asked for a ruling, and no ruling has been given. I ask now for a distinct ruling whether the hon. member for West Kimberley—[MR. CLARKSON: Sit down]—who stated in his speech that he was interested in this matter, was entitled to vote or not. The Chairman has not stated whether that hon. member was justified in voting or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then I rule that the hon. member was justified in voting.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Thank you.

Item—"Ale, Beer, and Stout, in bottles, per gal. 1s. 6d.:"

MR. R. F. SHOLL proposed, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 6d. a gallon, the same as before. He did so because bottled beer was consumed all over the country. In places remote from towns, such as at race meetings in the North, imported bottled beer was the usual drink, and it must be the imported

English beer, as the colonial brew was not good enough or would not keep.

MR. RICHARDSON moved, as a further amendment, that the duty be reduced by 3d. a gallon. He said a reduction of 6d. would be too much, as the previous item had not been reduced.

MR. R. F. SHOLL's amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion), referring to the remaining amendment, said there had been much talk about consistency, yet the mover of this amendment for a reduction to 1s. 3d. a gallon was one of the Commission who had recommended that this duty should be 2s. a gallon. He asked the hon. member to explain the difference in his action in the House as compared with his action as a member of the Commission.

MR. RICHARDSON said that, as the recommendations of the Commission were not accepted as a whole by the Government, each member of the Commission was free now to try and get what alterations he could, without being bound to any one of the recommendations. But, on this item of beer, the Commissioners had been unanimous.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said the statement made did not explain what he had asked.

MR. RICHARDSON said it explained a good deal of the inconsistency. The keystone of the Commission's recommendations was an Excise duty, and that had not been adopted.

MR. A. FORREST said the real explanation was to be found in the composition of the Commission, which was such that its members made compromises with each other right through the list of items. He felt sure the hon. member for the DeGrey had not consented willingly to put a duty of 2s. a gallon on imported bottled beer, and that the hon. member for North Fremantle would rather have recommended a duty of 1s.

MR. RICHARDSON said that if there was one item on which the Commission were unanimous it was this one.

MR. MOLLOY said this was a compromise with a vengeance. The former duty was 33 per cent. *ad valorem*, but the increase in the schedule would amount to 17 per cent. additional, making the

duty 3d. a bottle on imported beer. The consumer was asked to contribute an excessive proportion to the revenue; and, assuming that bottled beer was an article of general consumption, this duty would be oppressive upon the labouring classes, because beer was their drink. To say it was necessary to tax them to this extent on their beer was monstrous. If this high duty was put on as a protection to a local industry, then this was protection with a vengeance. If a local industry could not flourish without such excessive protection, it was not the duty of the House to encourage such an industry. Apart from the quality of the article, the people who drank beer should be allowed to choose the kind which they preferred to have taxed to this monstrous extent.

MR. HARPER said it came with bad grace from the Commissioner of Lands to attack members of the Commission on the score of inconsistency. The hon. gentleman was himself largely responsible for the existing tariff, and had formerly agreed to make bottled beer and draught beer pay the same duty. It now appeared that he proposed to charge them differently.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said that, personally, he was in favour of the duty, the two classes being equal, but the Government, in their wisdom, had decided that there should be a difference.

MR. MONGER said the extra duty would only amount to 1d. per bottle, and he supported the item in the Bill.

The committee divided on MR. RICHARDSON'S amendment, with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	13

Majority against ... 2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. DeHamel	Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Cookworthy
Mr. Loton	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Molloy	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Pease	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Phillips	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Marmion
Mr. R. F. Sholl	Mr. Monger
Mr. H. W. Sholl	Mr. Fiesse
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Solomon
Mr. Simpson (Teller).	Mr. Traylen
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. Paterson (Teller).

Amendment negatived, and item passed.

Item—"Arrowroot, Sago, Tapioca, Cornflour, and other Farinaceous Foods, per pound 1d.:"

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, as an amendment, that the letters "N.O.E." be inserted after the word "Foods."

Amendment put and passed, and the item, as amended, agreed to.

Item—"Beef, salt, per pound 1½d.:"

MR. DEHAMEL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by ½d. He said salt beef was a necessary of life to a large number of people, and, as such, should be taxed lightly.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the former duty was 1d. per pound, but the Commission recommended an increase of ½d., and the Government accepted it, as the increase would assist the local production, because the salting of beef could easily be done in the colony, there being vast areas of grazing country in Kimberley and the North-West.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Boots, Men's Leather, per dozen pairs 18s.:"

MR. MONGER moved, as an amendment, that the item be struck out. He expressed surprise that the Government had been led away by the recommendation of the Commission, by accepting such an absurd duty as this. To require the importer of a 4s. pair of boots to pay a duty of 1s. 6d. was out of reason, while the importer of a 30s. pair had to pay only the same duty. He was also surprised that the members of the Commission could have the effrontery to come to this House with such a recommendation. This would be an unfairly heavy tax on the labouring men, who could not afford to wear expensive boots. His intention had been to move that the duty on boots be a uniform *ad valorem* duty of 15 per cent., but finding this amendment would be out of order, he moved that the item be struck out.

MR. MOLLOY said this principle appeared to run through all the items, that the working class were to be taxed, while the richer portion of the community were exempted altogether. This principle was especially evident in this duty on boots, there being no discrimination between cheap and dear boots, but all having to bear the same duty. He supported the amendment.

MR. DEHAMEL also supported the amendment, and said this proposed duty on boots was one of the hardest slaps at the working man that had been attempted by the Government. The working man wore bluchers at 5s. a pair, the duty being 1s. 6d. The rich man could afford to order his boots from London at £2 a pair, and yet would pay only 1s. 6d. duty. This was simply iniquitous. He wondered at the Government for having ever dreamt of adopting the recommendation of the Commission in this respect.

MR. A. FORREST said he had expected to hear a great deal about the poor working man, as the general election was approaching, but he hoped the working man would have the sense to take a practical view of this and similar questions. Local shoemakers, who were also working men, needed some protection against the importation of cheap rubbish, which swamped the market; and this duty would operate to the benefit of the poorer class, who wanted to have regular local employment. This "working man" cry was used by some hon. members as their trump electioneering card, but sensible working men would look at facts.

MR. MOLLOY said the hon. member who had just spoken wanted to exempt the upper classes from taxation, and at the same time professed to be the champion of those who wanted to create work in the colony. When the voters read the newspaper reports of this discussion, they would be able to discriminate as to who was striving in their interest, and who was not. As a representative of the democracy, he would endeavour to protect the interests of the constituents who had elected him.

MR. PEARSE said he felt some diffidence in speaking on this question. The Commission had given great consideration to it. About £35,000 worth of boots were imported into this colony in the last year, and many first-class workmen in this line of industry were walking about unable to obtain employment, because the importations of cheap boots swamped the market. In South Australia the duty on boots was 33 per cent. *ad valorem*. Cheap boots from England and bankrupt stocks from other colonies flooded this market. It was best, he thought, to put boots in the list of specific duties, as now proposed, in order to check the cheap importations.

MR. QUINLAN said that, in respect to previous items, he had been careful not to vote on any item in which he was personally interested. As to boots, he supported the item in the schedule, and preferred a specific duty on boots, because it was notorious that *ad valorem* invoices were made up, in many cases, for the purpose of defrauding the revenue. If any industry was worth fostering, it was that of shoemaking. He suggested that certain sizes of boots should be specified in the schedule.

MR. RICHARDSON said the true working man bought colonial-made boots. Specific duties were always preferable to *ad valorem*. If the rich man was let off easily in the matter of boots, he had to pay pretty considerably on luxuries. *Ad valorem* duties were evaded by "salting" invoices.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said the cheap imported article was of an inferior quality, and the locally-manufactured article was generally preferred. He recommended—though not as a member of the Government—that a maximum price be fixed for boots in the specific list, and that other boots over that price should pay *ad valorem* duty.

MR. DEHAMEL said that if hides were imported free, there would be less objection to this duty on boots.

MR. LOTON said an *ad valorem* duty would be the fairest, but, as an alternative, he suggested that the words "boots, plain," should be inserted as a definition, with a view to lessening the duty on working-men's boots.

MR. PATERSON said working men wore more expensive boots than he did, as he knew from observation.

MR. HARPER said the duty would have the effect of excluding the cheap class of inferior boots, which were now imported in large quantities, and sold at auction in the colony. He would have preferred to make a difference of duty according to the classes of boots, but the difficulties in the way were so great that the Commission found it impracticable.

MR. LEFROY said the working man was supplied with boots by the local factories. He suggested that the words "invoiced under 10s." be inserted as a limitation.

MR. MONGER said he was surprised at the weak arguments used by the Chairman of the Commission (Mr. Harper). As a representative of the importers, he was surprised to hear an interjection from the Premier insinuating that the importers would "cook" invoices. He did not know of a single firm that would condescend to "cook" an invoice.

MR. A. FORREST said he had been asked to join in "cooking" invoices.

MR. MONGER expressed surprise that an hon. member who was looked up to—

MR. A. FORREST said that sort of thing wouldn't wash.

MR. MONGER regretted to hear that it wouldn't. Perhaps nothing was to be gained by arguing about it.

MR. MOLLOY said most hon. members had referred only to cheap boots, and seemed to imply that the better qualities of boots could not be made in the colony, for which reason these qualities were to be admitted at a light duty. That was a novel way of encouraging a local industry—to allow boots worth £2 a pair to come in for 1s. 6d. duty, while boots selling at only 5s. a pair were to be charged also 1s. 6d. duty. The only fair principle was to fix the duty according to the value.

MR. A. FORREST said the speech just heard was refreshing. The *ad valorem* duties had been evaded systematically, wherever tried. This was especially the case in Victoria. He might tell the hon. member for York, and others, that when he had purchased dutiable articles in Melbourne, the dealers suggested to him, as an ordinary matter of business, that they supposed he would want the articles invoiced at the lowest rate for passing the Customs in Western Australia. This showed the practice was common, and business men knew that English and foreign importers did the same thing in sending goods to colonies in which the duties were protective. A specific duty, not too heavy, would keep out cheap rubbish, create employment within the colony, secure a good class of boots, and hurt nobody.

MR. RICHARDSON said that one witness before the Commission, who represented the tanning industry, stated in evidence that bluchers, water-tights, slippers, and other light-wear articles could not be made in this colony at prices any-

where near those of the imported articles, and that it would be useless to protect the local industry against these importations.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the evidence given by interested witnesses should be discounted. Mr. Allen, of the Perth firm of Brown and Allen, had stated that 12½ per cent. would not be a sufficient protection, in the cheaper articles, and it was only in the cheap lines that the local makers could not compete—the cheap stuff and low wages could not be touched. Mr. Allen also said the output from their factory was 300 pairs weekly; therefore that industry could not be languishing. This duty in the schedule was intended to be protective, and he was opposed to any protection, except by admitting raw materials free. An *ad valorem* duty would be the fairest.

The committee divided on the amendment, with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	13

Majority against ... 2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Clarkson	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Cookworthy	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. DeHamel	Mr. Harper
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Marmion
Mr. Loton	Mr. Paterson
Mr. Molloy	Mr. Pearce
Mr. R. F. Sholl	Mr. Phillips
Mr. H. W. Sholl	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Solomon	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Monger (Teller).	Mr. Traylen
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. Hassell (Teller).

Amendment negatived.

MR. LEFROY moved, as an amendment, as previously suggested, that the words "invoiced at or under 10s. per pair" be inserted after the word "leather." He would move afterwards that the higher priced boots, over 10s. a pair, be transferred to the 10 per cent. schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. member could not move to introduce a fresh item into any schedule, nor to increase any item.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this further question could be dealt with afterwards.

Amendment put and passed, and the item, as amended, agreed to.

Item—"Boots, women's, per dozen pairs 10s.:"

MR. MONGER moved, as an amendment, that the words, "invoiced at or

under 6s. per pair" be inserted after the word "women's." He moved this with a view to placing the higher priced boots in an *ad valorem* schedule.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said the fairest way would be to place the women's and children's boots in an *ad valorem* schedule.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Government could not add to the duties any more than hon. members could, without a Message from the Governor.

MR. A. FORREST said the Government had brought down what they thought should be the proper tariff, yet now the Commissioner of Crown Lands was offering this suggestion. He asked who represented the Government?

MR. RICHARDSON said he was pleased to see the Government willing to make some concession.

MR. PIESSE said there would be difficulty in dealing with women's boots according to quality. It would be easier to put men's boots in the 15 per cent. schedule, and that amount would be a sufficient protection.

Amendment put and passed, and the item, as amended, agreed to.

Item—"Boots, Children's, per dozen pairs 6s.:"

MR. PIESSE moved, as an amendment, that the item be struck out. He did this with a view to its being placed in an *ad valorem* schedule.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he was willing to strike out the item, with a view to placing these boots in the 15 per cent. schedule.

Amendment put and passed, and the item struck out accordingly.

Item—"Cement, per barrel 2s.:"

MR. RICHARDSON moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 1s. The Commission had recommended this reduction.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the duty in the schedule was the same as before.

MR. A. FORREST said the price of cement did not materially affect the prices of buildings.

MR. DEHAMEL agreed with this view, and said the total value of cement imported last year was only £5,000. The small reduction proposed in the amendment would be a trifle.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Chaff, per ton £1 10s.:"

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 10s. This would make it the same amount as before, and there was no necessity to protect this item, there being sufficient protection in the cost of freight by sea and other charges. If he were an agriculturist, he would be ashamed to acknowledge that he could not produce better chaff than much of the stuff that was imported. It would be ridiculous to tax the whole community for the sake of protecting an impecunious section who said they could not produce chaff without a high protective duty.

MR. CLARKSON supported the item, and said the imported chaff consisted of wheat straw mixed with a little hay.

MR. MONGER said the agriculturists as a class were not as impecunious as the squatters; and in fact their industry was in as healthy a condition as that of any other industry in the colony. The slur cast on agriculturists by the member for the Gascoyne was like some other of his remarks. The duty proposed in the schedule was a necessary one in the interest of the agricultural industry.

MR. A. FORREST said the West Kimberley constituency had no objection to this increase on chaff, as the hay in that district was of such a quality that chaff need not be imported.

MR. LOTON said the increase of duty would at least prevent the importation of inferior stuff, and that result was desirable.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that, in reference to the term "impecunious," he noticed that in the Tariff Bill every article produced by local agriculturists was to be protected with an increase of duty, and this seemed to show the farmers were so poor that they required extra assistance. It was because he did not believe they really were impecunious that he objected to these protective increases. They were grabbing all they could, like the hon. member for York, who would take all he could get, and try to make someone else pay the piper.

MR. PATERSON said he had heard of chaff being brought from another colony, and landed at a port near Fremantle for 7s. 6d. per ton, whereas if he sent chaff from

the Murray district to Perth he had to pay more than that for the cost of transit.

MR. H. W. SHOLL, referring to remarks made by the hon. member for West Kimberley, said he knew that hundreds of tons of chaff were sent to the Kimberley district, eighteen months ago. The member for York should know that the people at Yilgarn had to pay £30 a ton for chaff. Imported chaff was landed at Cossack, during the drought, for £11 10s. or £12 a ton.

MR. A. FORREST said the hon. member for Roebourne forgot that the cost of carting to Yilgarn was £25 a ton.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Cigars, per pound 6s.":

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 1s. He said this increase was not required for revenue purposes. He objected to give the Government too much revenue to waste; and there were men in office who would waste it as fast as the House gave it to them.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Cigarettes, per pound 6s.":

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 1s.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Dogs, each £1.":

MR. A. FORREST moved, as an amendment, that the item be struck out.

MR. LEFROY hoped the duty would be passed, particularly because in the neighbourhood of the residence of the hon. member (Mr. A. Forrest) night was made hideous by the howling of dogs.

MR. CLARKSON said there were too many dogs about.

Amendment negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Fish (preserved, tinned, and dried), per pound 2d.":

MR. QUINLAN moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 1d. He said there was only one small factory in the colony for the curing of fish, and as fish were scarce as an article of food, the duty should be reduced.

MR. SOLOMON supported the amendment.

MR. MONGER said this local industry did not require protection to the extent proposed. He moved, as a further amend-

ment, that the item be struck out with a view to its insertion in the 15 per cent. schedule.

MR. LOTON said a high protective duty was not required.

MR. MOLLOY and MR. R. F. SHOLL also opposed the duty.

MR. A. FORREST said the local fish factory was greatly interfered with by cheap importations, and this small duty would be a reasonable protection.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that in South Australia the duty on preserved fish was 2d. a pound, in Queensland 2d., in Victoria 2d., in Tasmania 15 per cent., and in New South Wales 1d. a pound.

MR. MONGER, by leave, withdrew his further amendment.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would accept the amendment for reducing the duty to 1d. per pound, and would move a further amendment.

Amendment for reduction of duty put and passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, as a further amendment, that the word "salted" be inserted after the word "tinned."

Further amendment put and passed, and item, as amended, agreed to.

Item, "Flour, £1 10s. per ton" (as recommended by His Excellency's Message):

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) stated that, in accordance with His Excellency's Message, received on the previous day, the duty in the schedule as printed had been increased from £1 to £1 10s. per ton, and this increase was also recommended by the Commission.

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved, as an amendment, that the item be struck out. He objected to any duty on flour, and although the increase of 10s. a ton had been recommended by the Commission, and was now accepted by the Government, that was no reason why the House should adopt it. He maintained that flour, as the staff of life, should be admitted free. The local millers did not produce a flour which would keep in the Northern climate, and the Adelaide flour ought not to be taxed for the purpose of assisting a local industry which failed to produce a satisfactory article. He objected also to interjections made by the member for West Kimberley.

MR. A. FORREST said the mover of the amendment generally got up ten times oftener than any other member, and if dissent were expressed he became abusive. The hon. member had shown that he did not understand the conditions of flour milling or importing, because if he did he would not talk so ignorantly about the local flour being inferior in its keeping quality. For himself, he wished to state publicly, as one interested in milling, and also interested in the Northern pastoral industry as largely as any man in the colony, that he sent large quantities of York flour to Northern stations, this flour being obtained through Mr. Monger, and he had never heard any complaint as to its keeping quality. The York flour which he had used so largely was equal to, if not better than, imported flour, even from Adelaide. If the House could help the local growers by this increase of duty, which would not be felt by retail consumers, this would be a move in the right direction.

MR. DEHAMEL said this was one of the most important items in the tariff, and, though he knew the amendment would not be carried, his sympathy was with it. He intended to move, as a further amendment, that the duty be reduced by 10s. a ton, leaving it the same as before. He was astonished at the weakness of the Government, in bending to the interested pressure which had been brought to bear on them since the Bill was introduced. He hoped the public would take notice of the action of the Government in seeking to impose further taxation on one of the main articles of food. The increase of 10s. a ton would make a difference of a halfpenny on the 2lb. loaf. If the Government succeeded, with their too patriotic, too loyal majority, in increasing this duty, he would then go straight for knocking the duties off tea and sugar, which the Government proposed to increase, because the necessaries of life ought to be admitted as cheaply as possible.

Amendment for striking out the item put and negatived.

MR. DEHAMEL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 10s.

MR. MOLLOY supported the reduction, contending that the cheaper rates of railway transit had rendered further protection to wheat-growers and millers unnecessary.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Government had carefully reconsidered the duty on flour, since the Bill was introduced, and having ascertained that a majority of hon. members, representing the people of the country, desired to increase the duty on flour by 10s. a ton, as recommended by the Commission, the Government had caused a Message from the Governor to be brought down for giving effect to that wish. The Government did not look on the tariff as either protective or free-trade, but as a revenue-producing tariff. It would protect local industries to a limited extent. As to flour, he had always been in favour of a reasonable duty; but, as to the precise amount, even a Premier could not always have his own way, because he must give and take, and members of the Government had to sink their individual views, in dealing with public matters, in deference to the wishes of the people generally. The value of flour imported last year was £48,323, which was an immense amount of money to send out of the colony for an article which could be so well produced here; and the House should try to encourage the local production of wheat and flour. Having previously imposed a duty of £1 per ton, there was no great principle involved in an increase to £1 10s.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the proposed increase was unnecessary from a protective point of view. As a mill owner, the hon. member for the Williams told them the other night that this colony did not produce enough wheat for the mills, and he had to import a large quantity for grinding. It was all very well to quote the protective duties of South Australia and Victoria, but those colonies had sufficient wheat and flour not only for themselves but for export. He did not know that this tax would press very heavily on the North, or that it would greatly benefit the South; but it was a vexatious tax.

MR. HASSELL moved that a division be taken immediately. After some remarks, he, by leave, withdrew the motion.

MR. A. FORREST denied that he was interested in flour milling in Perth, as stated by the member for the Gascoyne, who ought to know that he (Mr. A. Forrest) and the Attorney General owned nearly a third of the Gascoyne pastoral district, which that hon. member repre-

sented; also that they sent station supplies into the district, had to pay for them, and knew what they cost. For himself, he regretted that he had placed in those Northern districts nearly all he was worth, and almost lost it all. He looked after the interests of the district he represented, and by consenting to this duty on flour, as one interested largely in station supplies, he was paying back to the agriculturists what they had done in helping to protect the pastoral industry.

MR. COOKWORTHY expressed regret that the Government had consented to increase the duty, not because it would make much difference to the agriculturist, but he feared it would make a great difference to the Government at the coming elections, as it would then be used against them by those who would say they were increasing the cost of living, about which so much had been heard already.

MR. LOTON said the increase proposed by the Government and the decrease moved by an hon. member would make no perceptible difference to the agriculturist. There had been more noise about it in that Chamber than would be heard if the whole colony was canvassed from one end to the other. The question of the price of the loaf made no difference to the consumer; it was to him rather a question of wages. Even with an increase of 10s. or 20s. in the duty, there would be sufficient margin to the baker to enable him to sell his 2lb. loaf at the same price as at present. He agreed that the increase would encourage people to pay more attention to the cultivation of the soil.

MR. THROSSELL said the extra 10s. per ton was equivalent to about one-sixteenth of a penny per pound weight; and while this small amount would not be appreciable to the consumer, it would be a large help to the farmer on his year's crop of wheat. Consideration should be given to farmers as being the backbone of the community. Reckoning the amount of flour imported last year at 5,000 tons, and taking this at ten bushels to the acre in wheat, the importation was equal to 25,000 acres of standing corn; and if this corn had been grown in the colony, there would have been £50,000 expended among the farmers during one year, in payment for producing the wheat.

Carrying the calculation farther, 100 farmers of 250 acres each would have required agricultural implements and machinery for cutting and reaping and threshing this amount of corn, thereby giving a large amount of employment and profit to those who manufactured or supplied the machinery. There was a large amount of flour available at present in the Eastern districts, and why could it not be sold? Because the warehouses in Fremantle, Perth, and other towns were filled with consignments of flour sent from other colonies to be sold here for what they would realise. As to the North-West, so long as the South and East submitted to a tax on beef and mutton for the benefit of pastoralists, the North-West should submit to a tax on flour for the benefit of agriculturists.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said he had to separate himself from his Ministerial colleagues, on this question, as he had always opposed a tax on flour, and could not conscientiously support the proposed increase. He would withdraw from the Chamber while a division was taken, as he would not vote against his colleagues, and could not vote for the increased duty.

MR. LEFROY would prefer to see flour admitted free, but local industries had to be protected, and in a protective tariff the industries should be protected all round. When this duty had caused sufficient corn and flour to be produced in the colony for its needs, the price of flour would be cheaper in the colony than at present. He supported the increase.

MR. MONGER moved that the committee do now divide. At the request of hon. members, he withdrew the motion, by leave.

MR. HASSELL supported the increase, believing it would help the grower, and not hurt the consumer.

MR. H. W. SHOLL said that, as a representative of a Northern district, he would not object to the increase of duty if the local millers could supply flour that would keep wholesome for a reasonable length of time in the Northern climate. He knew that the class of local flour which had been tried would not keep six months, whereas Adelaide flour did keep, when tested alongside of the local flour, for a period of six months.

The local flour was not dry enough to keep well.

MR. PIESSE said the trial mentioned by the last speaker could not have been a fair one. Before he and others went into the milling business, the most perfect machinery the world could produce was obtained, and he had heard experienced visitors say that certain mills in this colony were equal to any in the Eastern colonies. It was not for want of proper machinery or suitable grain that the local millers were unable to turn out good flour. It was nonsense to suppose that any experienced miller would damp the flour to increase the weight, before sending it North, knowing that when damped it would not keep. A lady resident at West Kimberley, lately passing through the South, mentioned the trouble there was in keeping Adelaide flour in the Kimberley district. In justice to the millers and others who had invested a total of £35,000 in the industry in this colony, every encouragement should be given to assist millers and wheat growers. In the year 1889 there was a proposal before the Legislative Council that a bonus should be offered to anyone who would erect roller flour mills; but recently several mills had been erected in the colony, without a bonus.

MR. SIMPSON objected to the increase as being a millers' duty. He had the fact straight from millers. He also had an assurance of a mill-owner in that House who said he could not grind fast enough to meet the demand. Two mills running all the year round could grind all the corn grown in the colony at present. Therefore this extra duty would be a tax on the consumer for the benefit of the millers. If the extra 10s. a ton would not be paid by the consumer, who would pay it? Did any hon. member really think the benefit would go to the farmers? Could any one show him, in the whole history of protection, where the increase of duties caused an increase of wages? Not a shilling of this duty would reach the farmer. Adelaide flour and wheat gave the standards of the world, and even in New Zealand, a wheat-growing country, Adelaide flour was imported, because the best of bread could not be made without a proportion of Adelaide flour. This high duty would impose such restrictions on the colony as would retard its progress.

The tariff proposed by the Government would impose an extra duty of 15s. a head on every person in the colony. This sort of coddling would coddle the farmer to death, because the coddling could not be kept up. After the last speech from the Minister for Lands, hon. members were beginning to realise what a splendid man he would be in Opposition. As to his own action while sitting on the Commission, he opposed every increase and supported every reduction.

MR. MONGER said that as to the standard wheat and flour being produced in Adelaide, he referred the hon. member (Mr. Simpson) to the decisions of the judges at the Produce Exhibition recently held in Melbourne, where an exhibit of Western Australian flour secured the third prize.

MR. SIMPSON said he meant to say that Adelaide wheat and flour had established a standard of comparison.

MR. MONGER said it was the hon. member's duty, as one of the Tariff Commissioners, to see that no extra and unnecessary duties were imposed, and yet the Commissioners' report recommended an increase of 10s. per ton on flour. About 5,000 tons were imported last year. He had conversed with bakers in Perth and Fremantle, and he could state, on their authority, that an extra duty of 10s. or 20s. a ton on flour would not increase the retail selling price of bread. He denied that this increased duty would be a millers' tax. The benefit would really go to the farmers, and nothing would better help on the Premier's land settlement scheme than this increase in the duty on imported flour.

MR. PHILLIPS congratulated the Government on having re-considered the duty on flour, and now proposed an increase. He regretted that the increase was not still more. In the Irwin district, there were over 4,000 bags of wheat lying in warehouses at Dongarra, which could not be sold; and most of it was held by small men, who were unable to get even an offer for it. The cost of freight to Fremantle from Dongarra was 15s. a ton, and, at the same time, wheat was being landed at Fremantle from Adelaide for only 5s. a ton freight. This was an unfair handicap, and knowing also that bankrupt stocks, and other stocks that must be sold for realisation, were

being sent here from other colonies, the local farmers needed some protection.

MR. LOTON said all were desirous that the cost of living should be cheap, and he thought it was cheap at present. The production of wheat was now so large, in the wheat-producing countries of the world, that each producing country had to protect itself. An extra duty would tend to check the influx of wheat and flour where there was an excess of production.

MR. RICHARDSON said the increase of 10s. a ton was not worth fighting about. In the Commission's recommendations there was a considerable set-off for those districts which did not produce flour, but the Government had altered the adjustment which the Commission endeavoured to make.

MR. CLARKSON moved that the committee do now divide.

Motion put and passed.

The committee accordingly divided on the amendment, with the following result:—

Ayes	10
Noes	15

Majority against ... 5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Cookworthy	Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Darlôt	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Molloy	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. R. F. Sholl	Mr. Loton
Mr. H. W. Sholl	Mr. Monger
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Pearse
Mr. Solomon	Mr. Phillips
Mr. DeHamel (Teller).	Mr. Piesse
	Sir J. G. Lea Steere
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Traylen
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. Paterson (Teller).

Amendment negatived, and the item passed.

Item—Hay, per ton £1 10s.:—

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 10s. He said that even the most greedy and uncompromising of agriculturists ought to be satisfied now with what they had got in this schedule, and should not ask for more.

The committee divided on the amendment, with the following result:—

Ayes	6
Noes	18

Majority against ... 12

AYES.
Mr. DeHamel
Mr. Molloy
Mr. Richardson
Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Simpson
Mr. R. F. Sholl (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Darlôt
Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Loton
Mr. Marmion
Mr. Paterson
Mr. Pearse
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Traylen
Mr. Venn
Mr. Monger (Teller).

Amendment negatived, and item passed.

New item:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in accordance with His Excellency's Message, moved that the item "Hides (green), per hide 1s. 6d.," be inserted after the item "Hay."

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 1:19 o'clock a.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 21st September, 1893.

Aborigines Protection Board: Proposed abolition of—
Fremantle Water Supply Bill: third reading—Loan
Bill, 1893: third reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

ABORIGINES PROTECTION BOARD— PROPOSED ABOLITION OF.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. D. K. CONGDON, "That the Council concurs in the resolution agreed to by the Legislative Assembly, respecting the abolition of the Aborigines Protection Board."