

CARNARVON-BABBAGE ISLAND TRAMWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers), in moving the second reading, said: This is a very small matter. There is a tramway at Carnarvon, having a length of two miles 67 chains. The line has been constructed, and it was thought by the Government that authorisation was needed in order to work it under the Railways and Tramways Act of 1888. It is merely a horse tram to the new jetty at Babbage Island, connecting it with the town of Carnarvon. The intervening space was very unsuitable for a roadway, consisting as it did of lagoons and sandbanks; and the only way of bridging it was by laying down this line. I move the second reading.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What is the cost of the line?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I regret I cannot at the moment say. The peculiar formation of the country, which is a network of lakes, has made the tramway necessary.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I should like to suggest to the Minister for Lands—

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member is out of order, as there is nothing before the House.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): I have a good idea of what the hon. member intended to convey; and that was, seeing we have very little business likely to come before the House to-morrow, and that next week the principal show of the State will be held, and will occupy Tuesday and Wednesday, at which I know a great number of country members desire to be present, it would be well in these circumstances for the House to adjourn until next Tuesday week. By that time, a certain amount of work will, probably, have come down from the Assembly; and we may then be able to

sit right on without any more breaks. I move that the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 5th November.

Question put and passed.

The House accordingly adjourned at 21 minutes to 9 o'clock until Tuesday, 5th November.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 23rd October, 1901.

PETITION: Sunday Theatricals—Railway Administration, Personal Explanation—Question: Railway Engine Sparks, new Funnel—Papers ordered: 1, Prison Warden at Fremantle, Dismissal; 2, Railway Workers, late Strike Incidents; 3, Cookgardie Water Scheme, Correspondence—Return ordered: Perth Park Board, Particulars—Motion: Federal Tariff, Effect on State Industries; a Protest (division)—R.C. Church Lands Amendment Bill (private), first reading—Motion: Sanitary Site at North Perth, to Inquire—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION—SUNDAY THEATRICALS.

MR. JOHNSON presented a petition from the Synod of the Church of England in Western Australia against theatrical companies holding performances on Sundays, and praying that in the event of existing legislation being found insufficient to prevent such performances, new legislation should be passed.

Petition received, read, and ordered to be printed; to be considered on the next Wednesday.

RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION — PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

HON. F. H. PIESSE (Williams): Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I desire to make an explanation to the House in regard to a statement I made a few evenings ago concerning Mr. Alexander, Mayor of Fremantle. I stated that I understood Mr. Alexander had expressed himself as in sympathy

with the fettlers' demand for an increased rate of pay. The reason why I made the statement was that I had seen in the newspapers a report that a motion brought before the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce relative to the strike, had been amended or proposed to be amended by Mr. Diamond, who expressed the opinion that almost everybody was agreed that the men deserved the increase of wages asked for. Mr. Diamond's amendment was seconded by Mr. Alexander, who, I understood, indorsed the opinions expressed by Mr. Diamond. I am assured, however, that Mr. Alexander did not indorse those opinions, but simply seconded the amendment proposed by Mr. Diamond. Having assured myself, therefore, that Mr. Alexander did not express the opinions I attributed to him, I feel that in justice to the gentleman it is my duty to withdraw the remark I made.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ENGINE SPARKS, NEW FUNNEL.

MR. F. McDONALD asked the Commissioner of Railways: 1, What is the cost of fitting soft-coal funnels to each engine at Fremantle Loco. Shops with annular exhaust, and what advantage is derived. 2, Whether it is a fact that instructions have been given to take one of these funnels off an engine ordered to Geraldton.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: 1, About £35. The advantage derived is the reduction of the risk of fire from sparks to a minimum. 2, Yes.

PAPERS—PRISON WARDER AT FREMANTLE, DISMISSAL.

On motion by MR. F. McDONALD, ordered: That all papers relating to the dismissal of William Taylor, warder in Fremantle prison, be laid on the table of the House.

PAPERS—RAILWAY WORKERS, LATE STRIKE INCIDENTS.

On motion by MR. H. DAGLISH, ordered: That there be laid on the table of the House—1, All papers relating to the appointment of Railway Engine-driver W. R. Trenowith to the position of night foreman at Southern Cross loco. sheds. 2, All papers connected

with the charge preferred against Night Foreman Trenowith of inciting certain cleaners to refuse duty during the recent railway strike. 3, All papers connected with a charge against Traffic Officer Kendall of abusing Driver Lyons during the railway strike.

PAPERS—COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME, CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) moved: That a copy of all the correspondence that passed between Mr. Rayner and Mr. Hodgson, the engineer of the Coolgardie Water Scheme, be laid upon the table of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. H. Kingsmill): So far as any correspondence which had passed officially between Mr. Rayner and Mr. Hodgson was concerned, he had no objection to laying copies on the table. If, however, there had been any correspondence of a private nature, it was, of course, out of his power to produce it. He understood that Mr. Rayner had written a good deal to the Press, and that his letters had been answered, also through the Press, by Mr. Hodgson.

MR. TAYLOR: The Minister was not expected to supply what he did not possess.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: So long as that was understood, he was perfectly satisfied to agree to the motion.

Question put and passed.

RETURN—PERTH PARK BOARD, PARTICULARS.

On motion by MR. H. DAGLISH, ordered: That a return be laid on the table of the House, showing—1, The names of all members of the Perth Park Board. 2, The number of meetings held by the Board during the twelve months ending 30th September, 1901. 3, The number of meetings attended by each member. 4, The total amount of public money which has been expended in the Perth Park.

MOTION—FEDERAL TARIFF, EFFECT ON STATE INDUSTRIES.

A PROTEST.

MR. A. E. MORGANS (Coolgardie) moved:

That this House views with consternation the Federal Tariff which has been promul-

gated, in view of the serious consequences that must result to the trade and commerce of this State, as well as to the mining industry, which is one of the principal elements of prosperity; and this House respectfully enters its protest against the imposition of the proposed tariff in its present form.

This motion is one referring to a very important question in regard to the future of Western Australia. The promulgation of the new Federal Tariff has certainly caused some anxiety in this State, and the more it is looked into the more it presents itself as a serious matter for the future of Western Australia. I would like to say that some of my friends on the bench representing Labour interests have some objection to the wording of the motion; not in principle, but with regard to the construction of the sentence. The motion as it appears on the Notice Paper reads: "That this House views with consternation the Federal Tariff," and so on. My friend the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) seems to think that "consternation" is rather a strong expression; and if I can, with the permission of the House, alter the wording of the motion either now or at a later stage, I shall be glad to do so, and if allowed I would put it in this way, "That this House views with much anxiety," instead of "consternation." It may be said that the opposition to the Federal Tariff is one based on opposition to federation. So far as I am concerned, I have not viewed it in that light at all. It will be remembered that in this House when we had various discussions on the question of federation, although I told the member for East Perth on several occasions that there was no more stanch federalist in the House than myself, yet I could not convince him of the fact; and the reason was that when this great question of federation came before this House, I was most desirous that the whole people of this State should give proper consideration to all the conditions that were proposed, before they took their final leap. I was never in any sense opposed to federation, and to the principle of federation I was always a strong adherent. I say now that, so far as the principle goes, I am well pleased indeed that federation has been accomplished in the Australian States. Having made that explanation, I may say that I did view with some anxiety what the results would

be on this colony when the consummation took place; and it is my object this afternoon to lay before the House some of the effects as they appear to me. I heard during the debate last night on the Financial Statement some references made to the regrets of hon. members on the other (Ministerial) side of the House that they had entered into federation.

MR. HOPKINS: No regrets here.

MR. MORGANS: I said I had heard it expressed by some members last night, that certain members on the other side of the House had felt regret at the consummation of federation, in view of this tariff.

MR. HOPKINS: That is quite a mistake.

MR. MORGANS: I was going on to say that I do not think that was a fair allusion, and I do not think it is right to insinuate or infer that hon. members on the other side are responsible for this tariff, nor do I think it right for any member of this House to suppose that members of that side do not view with anxiety also the introduction of this tariff. As a matter of fact, the promulgation of this tariff has nothing to do with the principle of federation; and therefore I do not think it was right last night to allude to it as was done by some members in discussing the Financial Statement. To myself, one of the most serious aspects of the question is the effect of this Federal Tariff on the mining industry of this State; and I think it can be shown that the effect will not only be most serious but also far-reaching, and that the result will be disastrous to the mining industry of this State unless there is some very solid change or very important reduction made in the tariff as it has been promulgated. It is not so much the question of the effect of this tariff on the rich mines of this State as it is the effect of the tariff on the low-grade mines. These are the mines that will feel the effect of the tariff imposed; and when we regard the fact that it is the moderate and low-grade mines of this State that will in the future produce most of the gold wealth of the State, I think it is due to us to consider what the effect will be, not entirely on the mines which are operating at the present time, but on the mines which will be operated in the future. We know quite well that in Kalgoorlie you will find in the short space of one and a half

square miles a group of the richest gold mines known to the world; and therefore in so far as some of these mines are concerned, I do not desire to say that the imposition of this tariff will mean ruin to those mines. Unfortunately, all the mines of Western Australia are not like those of Kalgoorlie; and it is perfectly certain that a very large number of the mines which are now struggling for existence, if the tariff is accepted, will be wiped out of existence, and a very large number of the leases that are now being exploited by prospectors and others under very serious difficulties will also be wiped out. In order to show the exact position of the mining industry of this State, I will quote some figures taken from the official reports of the Government. The figures are for the year 1900, and I may say I cannot get any figures for this year, or at any rate I cannot get complete figures. However, in order to draw comparisons and to show the condition of the industry under the Federal Tariff and the State Tariff, it would be better to take the year 1900, which will give an approximate idea of the state of things at the present time. We see from the returns issued by the Government that the total production of wealth in this State and exported amounts to £7,194,000 in round numbers. The difference between this amount of production and the gold produced is £6,007,610, and the value of other minerals besides gold amount to £172,000, making a total in gold and minerals of £6,179,800. These are the figures obtained from the last report issued by the Mines Department in connection with the mining industry of the country, and these figures show that of the total production of wealth in this State, gold accounts for 84 per cent., other minerals 2 per cent., and from all other sources of industry 14 per cent. of the total wealth of this country. Therefore I think hon. members will see how very important the gold-mining industry is to the well-being of Western Australia. Having these figures before us I should like to call the attention of the House to some other facts also gleaned from the official records of the State. The figures I have given show the importance of the gold-mining industry, and the figures I will now give must impress themselves on

the minds of hon. gentlemen present, and I hope also upon the public outside this House. In the year 1900 the total value of machinery imported into the State was £513,000, in round numbers. There is unfortunately no means of classifying this machinery; the Government returns, as far as I have been able to ascertain, do not show what the proportion of mining machinery is to the other classes of machinery imported; but from my knowledge of the industrial condition of this State, I think it is quite fair to assume that by far the largest proportion of machinery imported in 1900 was for mining purposes. To show what rapid strides this industry made in this State in one year only, we see from the reports of the Collector of Customs that between the years 1899 and 1900 there is an increase of £116,000 in the imports of machinery. This House could not have, nor could the public of the State have a stronger proof of the great importance of the mining industry than that, nor of the great strides the industry is making in the State at the present time. Looking at the figures which I have obtained, with some difficulty, during this last week, although I regret they are not complete, I may state to the House, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the proportionate increase of machinery introduced into the State in 1901, as compared with 1900, is far greater than that between the years 1899 and 1900. It will be quite easy to show at the end of the year that there has been even a greater increase than 25 per cent. for the year; therefore taking into account these figures and the enormous increase in the importation of machinery, we cannot doubt the fact that the mining industry in the State is making progress that no other industry is making, and that the commercial progress of the State depends on this great industry. In addition, although it is quite impossible from the returns of the Collector of Customs to give details, from my knowledge of mining I have calculated that, in addition to the above imports of machinery, the mining supplies in the form of renewals has also increased to the sum of £100,000. This machinery is not detailed in the tariff, but I know from my experience, taking the number of ounces of gold extracted, and it is a low estimate to say the

value of the renewals imported into the State to keep the mining machinery going in proper order must amount to the sum named. If we add to the total of £513,000 (the value of the imported machinery) the £100,000 for renewals, that will make a total of £613,000. It is only fair in trying to arrive at a correct estimate of the real position of the question about to be discussed that we should make a deduction from the amount mentioned of £50,000, which will more than represent, I think, the value of the other machinery imported during this period. This will reduce the value of imported mining machinery and renewals to £563,000. What is the financial position of this part of the question? It is that under the State tariff, duty to the extent of 5 per cent. was paid on this class of machinery, and that involved the mine owner in an expenditure in duty to the amount of £29,150.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Five per cent. on machinery and 10 per cent. on parts.

MR. MORGANS: I am glad the hon. member has called my attention to that fact, as it shows I have very much underestimated my figures.

MR. GARDINER: The parts have 10 per cent. on them now.

MR. MORGANS: I am glad the hon. member has called my attention to the fact of the figures I have given being moderate and well within the mark: it will impress upon the House the statement I am making. I was about to say that when we look at the fact that the gold-mining industry of the country is the source of 86 per cent. of our wealth, £29,000 is a very fair amount indeed for the Government to raise as duties on machinery, when the machinery is really the premier cause of the production of the wealth. We know quite well that no Government can be run without revenue, and mining machinery, like other machinery, should pay some duty; and I think the duty paid by this great industry to the Government in 1900 was a fair proportion of what should be paid, seeing the industry is the principal cause of the production of the wealth of the country. The mine owners of the country were satisfied with that arrangement. But what do we find under the Federal Tariff? We find that if this quantity of machinery

had been introduced under the Federal Tariff, the duty paid on that machinery would have been £145,000.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: A sum of £170,000.

MR. MORGANS: I have my figures, and the hon. gentleman was good enough to state that I had under-estimated the amount, and I say the duties on £583,000 worth of machinery at 25 per cent. amounts to £145,750.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: It was only £323,342.

MR. MORGANS: What was?

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Machinery.

MR. MORGANS: In that case the returns of the Collector of Customs are in error. Here is the statement and I will read it. But according to the hon. gentleman's figures I should have said £150,000.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: You ought to have said £170,000.

MR. MORGANS: I thought the hon. member said £107,000. I beg to thank the hon. gentleman, and I am not at issue with him on the question. I did not quite understand the position: I thought the hon. member said £107,000, and I am glad that I find my figures are under the mark. Instead of £105,000, the Treasurer thinks the figures should be £170,000. According to my figures the increase would have been £116,000 in one year of duty on machinery introduced into this State. This is an appalling fact for the consideration of the House, when we look at the importance of mining machinery to this country. In addition to this extraordinary increase, which is really appalling, we have a farther disability introduced through the medium of the Federal Tariff, which appears to have been overlooked in the discussion on this important question. There is an increase of duties on the materials used in the mines, stores and other things, and I have taken these at a general average increase of 15 per cent., as near as I can get from the tariff. This adds to the burden of mining machinery £180,000 a year, which together with the increase of £145,000 upon machinery, makes a total increase, a farther burden on the mining industry of the country under the Federal Tariff, of £325,000 per annum. I would ask the

House, and I appeal to members to say whether this is not an appalling fact? Is that not enough of itself, without farther consideration, to prove that the operation of the Federal Tariff in this country must result in a very serious curtailment of the mining industry of the country. If that is not so I shall be surprised, and shall be glad to hear any argument brought to prove to my mind that this is not a very serious thing.

MEMBER: How would you propose to raise revenue?

MR. MORGANS: I am not the Federal Treasurer: it is not for me to explain how the revenue is to be raised. I am quite prepared to admit that the revenue must be raised, and from what I have seen of the Federal Tariff, I think I could have raised the necessary revenue for the Commonwealth without taxing mining machinery to the extent that has been done. If the Federal Treasurer desires any information on the point, or any light thrown into his dark mind, I shall be glad to assist him by throwing that light if he will give me an opportunity. What will be the effect of those increases on the supplies to the mines? A very serious one indeed. I see by the official returns of the Mines Department that last year there was raised of gold ore 1,200,000 tons in this State. Taking that as a basis of calculation, we see the effect, not of an increase of duties on machinery, but the effect of an increase of duties on stores and supplies, which, in connection with mines, "go on for ever," like Tennyson's brook. Taking the figures for 1900, we have an output of gold ore amounting to 1,200,000 tons. On that there is an increase of £325,000 in the cost, which results in an increase of 5s. 1d. in the cost of treating per ton of ore. This is a very serious matter for the consideration of the House, and it is a much more serious matter for the consideration of the Federal Parliament, when that body realises that hundreds of mines, not only in Western Australia but in all parts of the world, are working on a margin of profit smaller than the increase in the cost of working caused by the introduction of the Federal Tariff. In addition to that, if we take the number of ounces of gold raised in 1900, 1,500,000, we see that the Federal Tariff increases the cost of getting each ounce

of gold by 4s. 1d. These in themselves are facts that should make this House and this country pause to consider the effect of the Federal Tariff on our greatest, and I may almost say our only, industry. Apart from this industry, we have the timber industry, which produces about half a million pounds annually, I think. Next comes the wool, and then pearl-shelling; and after that there is very little in this State in the way of natural production. If we look at the general increase in the duties on machinery, it seems a very easy thing to say, "Well, we will put an increased duty of 25 per cent. on mining machinery"; but what does that increase of 25 per cent. mean on the cost? It means in this instance an increase of 400 per cent. in the duties paid on mining machinery. I ask, can any member of this House point to a single instance in the history of industry in England or in any British colony, where such an increase has been thrown on an important industry at one fell swoop? I do not think that in all the annals of the history of industry in British colonies or in Great Britain itself—indeed, I will go farther and say I do not think in the annals of industrial life and enterprise in any part of the world—has a case been known where an industry has been saddled without any intimation, without any warning or reason being given, with duties increased at the rate of 400 per cent. I say that the increase in these duties on mining machinery and stores is monstrous, is unfair to the mining industry, and absolutely unfair, moreover, to the best interests of this State. What will be the effect of those increases in the duties? The effect can only be to prevent the introduction of farther capital into this country. It may not absolutely stop the introduction of capital; but it will certainly have the effect of retarding and restraining the introduction of capital. It may be argued by some that this State does not require the introduction of farther capital. To those who argue thus, I can only say that I have nothing more to urge, and that there is no farther argument with them on the question. From my point of view, however, I say, and I believe, that the future, indeed the whole life, of this State, the increase of its produc-

tiveness, the raising of its commercial prosperity, and the well-being of all its industries, depend on the introduction of farther capital. What has been the result of the introduction of capital into this State? Has it not raised the State from a position of impecuniosity ten years ago to a position of affluence to-day? Has not that been the result of the introduction of capital? [MR. GARDINER: And labour.] If so, why should steps be taken, or why should efforts be made, to prevent the introduction of farther capital for the purpose of developing the latent resources of our country? I say that one effect of the Federal Tariff will be to retard—I will not say it will entirely stop, but at any rate it will seriously retard—the introduction of farther capital. Another very interesting aspect of the subject I am now discussing, is that the figures which I have given show the very important position the wage-earner occupies in regard to our gold-mining industry, and how his interests will be affected by the proposed Federal Tariff. I have taken some care in compiling my statistics, and I think they are very nearly correct. The total value of gold produced in 1900 was, as I said before, £6,007,610. Wages and salaries amounted to £3,400,000; dividends to £1,200,000; renewals, stores, fuel, freight, etc., to £1,400,000. From these figures it will be seen that the wage-earners of the State are interested to the extent of nearly 60 per cent. in its production of gold. I mention this fact in order to bring conviction to the minds of my friends, the gentlemen who so well and ably represent Labour in this House. I mention it in order to carry to their minds the conviction that this is a very important question for the working men of the State. I have shown that the working men have an interest in the question, and that it is not only the capitalist who is concerned, but the wage-earner as well. If the capitalist is hindered by the Federal Tariff, it follows as a matter of necessity —

MR. TAYLOR: That the wage-earner will suffer every time.

MR. MORGANS: The hon. member says that the wage-earner will suffer every time, and that is perfectly true. The circumstance constitutes one of my reasons for bringing the facts before the

House. I wish to show that the workers of this State are really more interested in the matter of the Federal Tariff than anyone else is. The figures I have given show really that the proportion of wages paid is 57 per cent. of the total production of gold in this State. Another interesting fact in connection with the subject is that the Government returns show there are 21,000 men directly engaged in the mining industry of Western Australia: indirectly, of course, there are several thousands more. If we were to take into account the indirect workers, for instance, the wood cutters and those interested in freighting to the mines, and so forth, it would be seen that the wage-earners in this State are really taking over 60 per cent. of its total production of gold. There can be no doubt, this being so, if the Federal Tariff is going to throw difficulties on the industry, not only will the industry itself suffer, but also those who are so nobly supporting it. Everyone connected with the industry will suffer, and those who will certainly suffer most are, as the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) very properly said, the wage-earners. Another aspect of the question which I think we should take in view is the effect of the Federal Tariff on the other States. I say the effect on them will be nothing like what it is on this State. The total production of wealth in the sister States does not depend, as it practically does in this State, on gold-mining. The imposition of the Federal Tariff on the mining industry of the other States will affect them very little indeed in comparison with this State. It is easy for Victoria to saddle taxation on Western Australia: I have no doubt the process is found a very pleasant one. It is at all times pleasant for some people to put taxes on the other man; and that is just what Victoria is doing to Western Australia, what the Federal Government are doing to this State. The Federal Government are taxing the only industry of any great importance in this State; and what for? For the purpose not entirely of raising revenue, but for the purpose of enriching the manufacturers of the other States. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] The importance of this great gold-mining industry is also shown by the fact that, so far

as one can glean from the returns of gold up to the end of September of this year, this State is producing at the present time 40 per cent of the whole of the gold raised in Australasia, including New Zealand. That fact shows, or should show, to the members of the Federal Government, to the Premier (Mr. Barton) and to our representative (Sir John Forrest).—

MR. HOPKINS: What, Sir John Forrest wants educating!

MR. MORGANS: Yes; on this question he evidently does want educating.

MR. HOPKINS: That is right; hear, hear.

MR. MORGANS: I regret to say that I am entirely in disaccord with him on the position he has taken up in regard to the Federal Tariff. [MR. HOPKINS: Hear, hear.] I was a very strong supporter of Sir John Forrest in this House, and out of it, for years.

MR. DAGLISH: You are now.

MR. MORGANS: I thoroughly believe in the man, as a man; but I certainly think he has gone astray on the question of the Federal Tariff. So far as I am concerned, I intend to offer all the opposition I possibly can to the Government of which he is a member; because I consider that Government a discredit to the combined States of Australasia. How is it that the great mining industry of this State, which produces 80 per cent. of our wealth, and 40 per cent. of the total gold yield of Australasia, receives such scant courtesy at the hands of the Federal Government? I have read through the whole of the papers published in the Eastern States during this debate; and, so far as I can gather, only two men have mentioned Western Australia in the course of the discussion on the Federal Tariff. Sir John Forrest was one. He mentioned Western Australia in a speech supporting the Federal Tariff, with which speech I do not agree. The only other reference to the mining industry of Western Australia was made by Mr. Reid. It is true that Mr. Barton gave the House, in the course of his reply to Mr. Reid, some figures relating to the introduction of mining machinery into this State; but it is evident from the tone in which the Federal Premier approached the question and discussed it, that he thought Western Australia

unworthy of more than a passing thought. I may say that when the time comes, I intend to correct Mr. Barton's figures in reference to the introduction of mining machinery into this State. The right hon. gentleman made a little mistake of £150,000; though, as it happened, his figures suited his argument admirably. I do not say for a moment that he intended to make the mistake; but he made good use of the figures so far as the members on his side of the House were concerned.

MR. HOPKINS: That is nothing for a protectionist.

MR. MORGANS: In any case I would like to inquire, in regard to this great mining industry which is the life-blood of this State, how is it that the Federal Government intend to impose a tariff on it that means crushing the very life-blood out of this industry? It will be the duty of members of this House to express their views on this question. I am fully aware that any motion we may carry here to-night cannot have the effect of altering the tariff; yet it may have an influence in changing the tariff. I know that anything we may say or do in this House at the present time can have no effect on the Federal Tariff, otherwise than as an influence on the minds of those who are handling the question on the other side. But it is a duty, in view of the terrible position we are placed in under this tariff, for members of this House to express their opinions; and if we pass a motion to-night, and if the Upper House pass a similar motion on some other occasion, expressing disapproval of the Federal Tariff, that expression of opinion must have the effect of favourably influencing the minds of the legislators on the other side, and of opening their eyes to the great injury which this tariff will do to this great mining industry in Western Australia. That the expression of opinion on this question will have the effect of placing mining machinery on the free list, is a result I do not expect; but I do expect that it will have the effect of making a material reduction in the tariff. There is another point with regard to the tariff, and that is the effect on the cost of living in this State. There has been much discussion on this question, and in the Press of this State I have read a large number of

letters on the question, especially in the *Morning Herald* and the *West Australian*; and I have read those letters with great interest, because they give the views of men who are interested in all branches of commerce. The net result of that correspondence is to show a consensus of opinion in one direction (I have not yet seen one instance of an opposing view), to the effect that this tariff will materially increase the cost of living in this State. There is no doubt about that, because the Federal Government actually propose, through their tariff, to put duties on the list that was free in this State before; on such articles as sugar, coffee, cocoa, kerosene, and various other commodities; and it is perfectly clear that the imposition of their heavy duties on these articles must increase the cost of living, while in addition there are other articles that were not on the free list of this State, but on which the duties have been largely augmented, as for instance on jams, preserved fruits, and articles of that kind. So far as I am able to judge from investigations made, it appears to me that the mining industry especially, or those engaged in it, will suffer very severely; and that this tariff will cause an increase of the food duties and an increase in the cost of living to the extent of 5s. a week per man and family. I am speaking especially of the mining industry.

MR. GARDINER: How many in a family?

MR. MORGANS: I cannot tell the number there is in the families of all the people on the goldfields.

MR. GARDINER: But what is the basis of your calculation?

MR. MORGANS: I take as a basis a man and wife with three children, making a family of five; although I have information received within the last few days from the goldfields, showing that one shilling per head per week is really too low for the increase that has taken place already in the cost of living on the goldfields, as a consequence of this tariff. But this estimate shows that the men engaged directly in the gold-mining industry will be affected by an increase which will give a total increase per week amounting to £5,250, and this increase in the course of a year will amount to £273,000, for the additional duties to be

paid by workers in the gold-mining industry under this tariff. If we add to this sum the extra duties which will be collected by the Federal Government on our mining machinery, the amount will be £325,000. Therefore we find a total increase in the cost to capitalists and in the cost to workers engaged in the gold-mining industry amounting to £698,000—practically £700,000 a year. That is a statement which should cause every member of this House to reflect; and I think that when the workers on the goldfields thoroughly realise the effect of this Federal Tariff on their cost of living, they also will reflect, and we shall have a serious outcry from the workers on the goldfields with regard to the imposition caused by this tariff. I know something will be said to me with regard to the State Tariff, and I intend to refer to that before I sit down. At this point I can only say that although the State Tariff has in the past imposed taxes on the working man, it has never imposed anything like the amount of taxation which the Federal Tariff now imposes on them. That was shown in this House two years ago, when we had a discussion on the food duties, and when I showed what the cost of the State duties was to the workers.

MR. GARDINER: From breakfast-table duties we got £117,000 last year.

MR. MORGANS: Yes; and you will get about £300,000 this year under the Federal Tariff, because you will tax a lot of things that were not then taxed by the State Tariff in Western Australia. But these figures relating to increase also include the cost of clothing as well as food. When we discussed the food duties on a previous occasion in this House, I proved by the Government returns from which I then quoted, and which were accepted by all members in the House at the time, that the total food duties imposed under the State Parliament amounted to 6d. per head per week, and at that time there was a duty of 30s. per head on imported cattle. The last Parliament took the duty off cattle, and what was the result? Meat went up in price! [Several interjections.] What I want to show, later on, is that as soon as the Federal Tariff is established, the manufacturers of mining machinery in the other States will raise the price of

their machinery up to the limit of the Federal Tariff.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: They have done it already.

MR. MORGANS: Yes; they are doing it already. The effect of our State Tariff was that it involved the workers in an expenditure of sixpence per head per week, while under the Federal Tariff now imposed the cost will be increased to considerably more than one shilling per head per week. Therefore the workers are bound to suffer under the imposition of this Federal Tariff. I will later touch on the State Tariff. Let us take now the whole of the population of this State, in order to arrive at the average increase in the cost of living. I think it is a fair estimate which no member here will be inclined to question, that the increase in the cost of living will be one shilling per head per week under this Federal Tariff; and if we accept that as a basis, and taking our population at 200,000 people, the result will be an increase in the cost of living equal to £10,000 per week; and the proportion will result in an increase of £520,000 in the year. That is a rather appalling fact. Here we have workers and others in this State complaining of the high cost of living, and still under this Federal Tariff it is intended to increase the cost of living in this State to the extent of more than half a million a year! If that statement is not such as to cause all people in this State to pause and use every effort to prevent this increase, then I do not know anything that will arouse them. If the workers and others who are interested in this great question are not prepared to look at the importance of the question through the imposition of this tariff, then I say there is a want of interest in it and a want of interest in the affairs of this State that is most regrettable. I find that the increase works out about £2 11s. per head per annum in this State; and I find, on reference to Sir G. Turner's figures, that he puts down the total amount of duty at £3 17s. 6d. per head for Western Australia. I think my estimate must be good, because when the other impositions are added to these, they will come more or less closely to the estimate made by Sir G. Turner. There is one other point that is of even greater interest in connection with the mining

industry, and that is its financial status. In order to show the grievous injury that will be done to the mining industry of this State, on examination of their financial position we shall find that it is not what the public of this State have generally supposed, and probably what the majority of members in this House have believed. It is generally supposed that mining companies in this State are prosperous, and that mining enterprise is fair game for exploitation. But when we look at the figures taken from the Government returns—I have been careful to confine my attention to returns given by the Government, so as to insure a reliable result—it will be seen that the mining industry is not making profits, except under the most favourable conditions, and that instead of imposing on it extra taxation, it should be fostered with all care and attention. In the year 1900 the total area of gold mining leases taken up and for which rent was being paid to the Government was 36,024 acres, leaving out the mineral leases. Of this number only a total area of 2,000 acres are paying any return for the outlay made upon them. I would like to ask if it has occurred to the minds of any hon. member in this House that this is the case. That is a fact which to my mind is most serious, and one that almost causes consternation as far as the mining industry is concerned. Here we have the official figures to show that only 5 per cent. of the total number of acres now being occupied for mining purposes is paying.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Is that taken from our returns?

MR. MORGANS: Yes. These returns are taken in this way, and I will refer to them in order that members may be quite clear on the point. I have the very excellent returns of the Department of Mines for 1900, and on page 13 of the mining returns members will find there a list of the companies which paid dividends for the year 1900, those which paid any return on the capital. They are 25 in number, and the area of ground occupied by these companies which are paying, I have ascertained, is 2,000 acres, therefore I think my figures are quite correct. I have not been able to ascertain the names of the companies which own the 36,000 acres, but there are 25 companies, accord-

ing to the Government returns, owning 2,000 of the 36,000 acres, and these 25 companies are the only ones which have paid any interest on their capital during the year under review—the year 1900. I will ask, is not this a fact with regard to the mining industry that should cause members in the House and people outside to reflect? Here you have the total profits of this great industry, which produces 86 per cent. of the total wealth of the country, furnished by 25 mines, and the balance of the mines, 95 per cent., are not all paying their expenses. This is an appalling fact; this is something that should make members pause before they come to the conclusion that the mining industry can stand any amount of burdens. Farther, I say although I have not been able to get returns of the profits and dividends paid this year by mining companies, I am perfectly sure a smaller number of companies paid dividends this year than last. I do not think that the amount will be less, but the number of acres producing dividends this year will be smaller than the number in 1900. However, we are in this position: only 5 per cent. of the mining companies in this State are paying, and 95 per cent. are not paying. In view of that fact is it right and proper that the Federal Government should try and stifle this industry with a tax of 25 per cent. on machinery? Is it right that the Federal Government should try and increase the cost of production of gold by 25 per cent.? If what I have stated is the condition of the mining industry in Western Australia, what hope is there for farther development if the paternal Federal Government intend to impose duties to the amount of £400,000. What is to become of the 25 mines, and the large number which are not paying expenses? What is to become of the mines struggling for existence? I say that the returns which I have given to the House should cause anxiety. They cause great anxiety to my mind, and I am perfectly certain they will cause anxiety to every member of the House who reflects on the position of the mining industry, and when he sees that 95 per cent. of the mines are not paying their way.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: You have become a pessimist.

MR. MORGANS: I am not a pessimist: I am giving facts, and the effect upon the mining industry. Take the Fremantle Smelting Works: that company uses 22½ tons of coke per day. There is a duty of 4s. per ton imposed on coke, which will make a difference of £14,000 a year alone in one article to the Fremantle Smelting Works. Here is an industry established under the protection of the Government—I believe the Government gave £5,000 towards the establishment of the industry.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: This Government?

MR. MORGANS: The late Government; at any rate the country gave £5,000 towards the establishment of the industry, and we know perfectly well that up to the present the company have been making a loss. We know that the company have had to reconstruct on one occasion, and I understand that some negotiations are pending at the present time for the purpose of farther reconstruction. Notwithstanding all that has been done for this industry, which has been established under the protection of the Government, here is an impost of 20 per cent. placed on coke which will make a difference of £14,000 a year on one article to this industry, and which will make a difference also to every other industry using coke. This is not right. How can this country stand up against this imposition? What hope is there of farther development of the mining industry of the country if the Federal Tariff is passed by Parliament? What hope is there for the mining industry of the State to prosper as it has done in the past? There is one point in connection with machinery. I see my friend, Mr. Gardiner, getting ready to reply to me. I know what he is going to tell me.

MR. GARDINER: To help you.

MR. MORGANS: I am sure the hon. member will help me as far as he can. I regret the member for East Perth (Hon. W. H. James) is not in his place, because I know he is a pronounced protectionist from head to foot, from shoulder to shoulder, right through bone, blood, flesh and muscle; but I know what his argument will be. He will say "But you can get all this mining machinery from Victoria." I say you cannot. The manu-

facturers of Victoria are not in a position to supply all the mining machinery required to-day by the State of Western Australia. It is idle to suppose they can do so. But supposing, for the sake of argument, that the manufacturers of Victoria can supply the machinery, as they are human they will simply follow the lines of the Federal Tariff and put up the price as closely as they can to the Federal Tariff. What advantage will it be to the mining industry whether they pay Fraser and Chalmers, of London, a 25 per cent. increase, or the Otis Company, of Melbourne, a 25 per cent. increase? It will go out of the pockets of the mining industry all the same, and we are that much short. It is idle to think these manufacturers are going to open their bowels of mercy towards the mining industry and supply machinery for less than we can get it elsewhere. What is the effect of the creation of a ring? It is to raise prices. And what is the Federal Tariff but the creation of a ring for the protection of manufacturers in the other States? That is what it is. I have facts before me at the present time showing that quotations have been made by manufacturers in Victoria for mining machinery here, and since the promulgation of the Federal Tariff those quotations have been withdrawn on account of the tariff. What will happen? You will stop the importation of machinery from England and the United States, and you will get it from the other States, but you will not get as good a machine, and you will have to pay 25 per cent. more for a vastly inferior article. I have the right to speak with authority on the question of mining material, because I have spent large sums of money on machinery, and I know its worth. I say for the same price, pound for pound, no manufacturer in Victoria can compete with the manufacturers in England and the United States for mining machinery, either in batteries, cyanide plants, engines and boilers, or any class of machinery you can mention. I do not deny that the manufacturers in the other States can make a fairly good battery or make a fairly good engine and boiler, one that will answer the purpose; but they cannot for a moment, for the same price, make an engine, a boiler, or a battery that will compare with a similar article made in England or the United States.

Why should the sweat of our brows in Western Australia be sucked by the manufacturers in Victoria for the purpose of filling up their purses and banking accounts? I have no objection if the duties are increased in this State, for the benefit of the State; I have no objection to a moderate increase; but the whole of the increases proposed under the Federal Tariff will not mean one iota of benefit to this State, but will simply go to the other States for the purpose of replenishing the banking accounts of many bankrupt manufacturers of the other States.

MR. HIGHAM: You are rather late in saying that. You ought to have said that when the federal debate was on.

MR. MORGANS: I did say when the discussion was on that we should observe caution in going into federation. But I do not want to be drawn into discussing the federal question now. I am a federalist, and I am glad that Australia has federated; but what I am standing up against now is that the Federal Government, elected by the people, are trying to impose on this State an unfair tariff. That is what I say, and I will not be drawn into any other position by the hon. member. I was about to say, with regard to raising the prices, that we know quite well that men are merely human beings, and they are keen enough to do all they possibly can to get what they possibly can. I refer to the manufacturers of Victoria. Mr. Reid gave a very good example of that the other day when discussing the tariff in the Federal House, I think on the motion of want of confidence. He cited an instance of how this works out, how this ring established under the guidance of the Federal Government will act. He instanced the manufacture of starch. There is a firm in Victoria by the name of Harper & Company, in which I hope my friend, the member for Beverley, is interested, because the business is a very profitable one. [MR. HARPER: I am not.] Under the Federal Tariff the firm in question gains to the tune of £20,000 a year, owing to the increase of duties. I regret my friend, the member for Beverley, is not connected with that firm. I am sorry for him. However, as to the question of starch, under the Victorian duties starch was made by this well-known firm and sold at 43s. per cwt. in

Melbourne, while at the same time this same starch was being sent to Sydney by this same firm and sold there for 26s. a cwt. What happened since the Federal Tariff was promulgated? The firm raised their price in Sydney to 42s. a cwt. too. This is just an instance of the tendency of the manufacturer to get all he can out of the consumer; and the same thing will obtain in Western Australia directly a 25 per cent. duty is imposed on mining machinery. Up will go the price in Victoria and the other States by 24 or 25 per cent. Nothing will prevent it. Therefore, it is simply idle for hon. members to argue that we shall be able to draw a supply of mining machinery from the other States as cheaply as we get it now. My eyes are not closed to facts. I am quite aware that when the manufacturers of Victoria have so increased in number and size that they can manufacture more machinery than is required in Australia, prices will come down. Directly the element of competition comes in, we shall find prices reduced. But what are the hopes of competition? I maintain the majority of hon. members now in this House will be in their graves long before that comes about. There is not the slightest chance of it. I will show why. This tariff, if enacted as proposed by the Federal Government, will not have that permanency of character which alone will induce capitalists to put up factories in Australia on the strength of it. There is an element of uncertainty as to the time this tariff will last, and therefore nobody, either from within or from without, will lay out capital in this State in putting up factories. There is only one condition under which factories will extend in dimensions and number, and that is if the Federal or any other Government give a guarantee that the duties will not be altered for 25 or 30 years. Under such a guarantee as that, manufactures would be established; but without that guarantee there cannot be large increases in the shape of manufactures in this or any other State. If the mining industry of the State be shut out from the markets of the world, the result will be that we shall be obliged to pay to the tune of three quarters of a million annually to support the Victorian manufacturers and other manufacturers in the

Eastern States. There are many other points calling for attention in regard to the tariff. There is the revenue producing aspect. The tariff which the paternal Federal Government desire to impose reminds me very much of the case of a man saying he is hungry and will not eat. The Federal Government tell us that this is not a protective tariff, but a revenue tariff. If that be so, are they not absolutely cutting all the ground from under their feet, and are they not enacting a tariff that will not produce revenue?

MR. NANSON: That tariff is a combination of the two.

MR. MORGANS: My friend the member for Murchison tells me that the Federal Tariff is a combination of a protective tariff and a revenue tariff. The trouble is, however, that I do not see where the combination comes in. All I see is this—and it is a very strange combination—the artificial industries are protected under this tariff, and nothing else is protected. That is where the combination comes in. I ask hon. members, is it a proper principle to protect the artificial industries of other States at the expense of the natural resources of this State? I say it is not. The whole prosperity and future of this State depend on the development of its natural resources. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Our prosperity depends, not on the development of the artificial resources of Victoria, but on the development of our own natural resources. That being so, why should we be called on to raise gold out of the ground in Western Australia to bolster up the artificial industries of the other States? Why should this be done? I say it should not be done. Let these industries stand on their own bottom! They have quite enough protection under ordinary circumstances. The freighting of finished machinery from England is quite sufficient protection: the cost of carriage is sufficient protection. Why should we be asked to give up a portion of our wealth for the purpose of establishing and sustaining artificial and exotic industries in the Eastern States? It is absolutely unfair; it is against all principles of political economy. Whatever may be said with regard to production in the other States, I maintain that if they cannot produce without interfering with the

development of the natural resources of the soil, they had better not produce at all. Let them stand down! I am not prepared, however, to admit that this interference is necessary. Taking the examples of Victoria and New South Wales, we find that in the latter State, where there has been no protection, industries have developed more rapidly than in the former, where there has been heavy protection.

MR. GEORGE: Did they not start with protection?

MR. MORGANS: Who?

MR. GEORGE: New South Wales.

MR. MORGANS: That is not the question. I am dealing with the facts as they are at the present time. There was protection in New South Wales for a very short time, I believe; but protection was found to be detrimental to the interests of the State, and a system of free-trade was inaugurated.

MR. GEORGE: That is right.

MR. MORGANS: Under free-trade New South Wales has prospered, and has established great industries. In New South Wales a success has been made of the principle of free-trade; whereas in highly protected Victoria there is more sweating, there is more low and bad pay, there are more girls introduced into factories, and there is more degradation throughout the whole of the industrial system, than in New South Wales. [MEMBER: More bankruptcy.] More bankruptcy also. How is it the industries of New South Wales flourish without protection, while those of Victoria are obliged to call on the mining industry of Western Australia to support them to the tune of 25 per cent. duties? The Federal Tariff, so far as we are concerned, is an iniquitous one; and unless the Federal Government are prepared to do something to grant relief to our mining industry, which is practically the principal producing industry of this State, the result will be a very serious one for us. When one comes to look at it, the position is really comic. I refer to the position taken by the Federal Government. Here they are saying, "We are going to put a duty of 25 per cent. on mining machinery, because we want revenue"; but, notwithstanding, when we complain about the duty, the Federal Government tell us, "Oh, well, you can get all your machinery from

Victoria: you need not import any, since you can get it all from Victoria." Such is the burden of Mr. Barton's cry. That gentleman seems to forget that if we get all our machinery from Victoria, we shall have to pay the Victorian manufacturer 25 per cent. more for his goods, while the Federal Government will get nothing out of the duties. That is the position. Is it not an absurd assumption for a gentleman in the position of Mr. Barton? He sets up a high tariff for the purpose of making us buy articles manufactured in Australia; and what is the result, if we buy? He absolutely gives away all the tariff, and has nothing left him to produce revenue. I say the position is foolish. The hand of the Victorian manufacturer is strongly in evidence in this tariff. Is it not strange that everything connected with the industries of Victoria—the woollen industry, the iron industry, manufacturing industries such as the hat and the boot—should under this Federal Tariff show the highest increases of duties? It is on articles produced in Victoria that all the highest increases have been made. Does it not point to the fact that the object of the tariff is not so much to secure revenue in order to carry out the duties of the Federal Government, as to protect those exotic, artificial industries which live on the blood of other industries drawing their sustenance out of the soil? I venture to believe the principles of free-trade will receive a strong impetus in this State from the present time. I think on the next occasion when any person proposes himself here as a representative in the Federal Parliament, he will have to come forward as a freetrader; otherwise there will be no chance of his getting into the Federal House at all. The last protectionist from this State has already gone into the House of Representatives; and I venture to say that when next Sir John Forrest returns to this State, he will have to return as a freetrader, or else he will never go back again. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] There is another view of the question which is not very cheering; and that is, what will be the effect on our mining industry as regards the respective positions of the worker and capitalist? I fear very much that the tariff will cause strained relations between the employed and the employer.

If the worker be asked to pay more for his living, it is only natural he should demand more wages. [MR. GEORGE: Hear, hear.] That is quite natural. But the reply of the capitalist, under the Federal Tariff, will be, "It is true that you are paying more for your living; but I have to pay more per ton for getting this ore worked, and therefore I am in as bad a position as you are." What will be the result then? The worker will say, "I am not satisfied: I want more wages." And we know what springs from that position. I can assure hon. members that I have frequently, since I have been in this State, heard there was to be a strike on the goldfields. Strikes have been predicted times out of number; but I have never seen any reason for alarm as yet. I have never yet looked for a strike, because there has been too much prosperity in many of the goldfield districts to justify anything in the way of a strike. I do think, however, that if the Federal Tariff be imposed, and if in consequence a large number of mines be closed down and a large number of men thrown out of employment, and from this there result a plethora of labour in the State, very likely requests will be made for a reduction in wages. When that day comes—a sorry day for Western Australia, and I for one will regret it as much as any man in the State—the result will probably be a strike which will bring more disaster on the community than even the general operation of the Federal Tariff. There are many other points which I might raise in this connection; but I will not say much more. I only wish to make a farther allusion to the policy of protecting Victorian industries, or any other artificial industries of that kind. Let us take, for example, a 10-stamp battery, and engine and boiler for working it. Probably the member for the Swan knows all about this, and I shall make some statements now—[Laughter.]

MR. GEORGE: Does the hon. member refer to me? I am not member for the Swan.

MR. MORGANS: I will say the member for the Murray; and then we shall be on a safe footing. I suppose the construction of a 10-stamp battery, with engine, boiler, and other appurtenances for working it, would cost about £3,000 if it

were made of good quality steel, and of good design. Out of that amount of £3,000, I take it probably £1,100 will be spent in wages. I am not quite clear as to this: it may be more or less; but it will probably be about £1,100. I am just giving this instance to show the advantage there is in encouraging the production of the riches of the soil as against the encouragement of artificial industries. The construction of this battery would give about £1,100 in wages; the rest of the money would be spent in material. Now, what will that battery do after it is made? It will cost at least £1,000 in cartage and erection; probably £1,500. In some cases far more than the original value is expended in cartage and erection; and most of that money is distributed in wages. That battery, which cost £3,000 to construct, will work for at least 15 years, keeping 30 men going and distributing about £80,000 in the form of wages principally. That shows what advantage there is in fostering industries of the soil rather than artificial industries. It shows that in the expenditure of only £3,000, which expenditure may be said to be in connection with an artificial industry, we obtain something which will disburse in wages alone a sum of almost £80,000 in the course of 15 years. I do not think I could give a better example to show the House that the policy of the Federal Government should not be one of protection, but rather one of encouraging the great natural industries of the States of Australia. The duty of the Federal Government should be to make all they can out of the natural resources, not to try and support artificial industries. Here in Western Australia we have untold wealth in the shape of gold; and I say, let us develop it. Why should the Federal Government place on our shoulders an incubus which will make it impossible for us to bring to light our hidden treasure in the form of gold and other minerals? I say it is a wrong policy; and if you were to erect in Victoria or in Western Australia to-day manufactories enough to keep the whole of the mining machinery in this State going, the value of that would not amount to the value of the production of gold in this State for one year. So I say it is absurd to tax this great industry, which is the life-blood of this

State. The whole success and future prosperity of this State depend on the development of this great industry; and it will be a sorry day for this State when the Federal Government or any other Government unwisely interfere with the development of the natural resources on which this State entirely depends. (General applause.)

MR. J. GARDINER (Albany): It will be admitted on all sides that, having handed over the control and power of taxing ourselves through the customs to the Commonwealth Parliament, this motion can be looked upon only in the light that it will show to the Federal Government the feelings of Western Australia with regard to the Federal Tariff. As the mover has said, no practical outcome can result from the motion being passed by this House, or from any vote of this House; but from the other side and even in this State we hear strong complaints in regard to the operation of the Federal Tariff, and I think as a result of that we shall have a tariff very much modified before it eventually passes. I feel sure that is the object of the mover in bringing this motion forward, that not only this House, but the country through this House, should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the tariff. I was pleased to hear from the mover words of wisdom with regard to federation. I resent very much the fact that federalists are accused of being responsible for this tariff. I say that so far as the federalists of this State are concerned, we sent to both the Senate and the House of Representatives free-traders with one exception, that exception being a gentleman whom a large number of those now chastising us for our part in federation are most heartily supporting, a gentleman who was then their "guide, philosopher, and friend" in this State, and they knew no other god in the political world. Therefore, why should we who voted for federation be accused now of being responsible for this Federal Tariff? When the mover referred to mining machinery, I thought probably he was putting absolutely the worst side of the case; for, taking the tariff as a whole, I find that the duty on the particular imports shown in the last year's returns would amount on this scale to £127,703; and even on the showing of

the hon. member (Mr. Morgans), I take it that at least half of that machinery was manufactured within the Commonwealth. Consequently, without our individual thoughts influencing the conditions, we come to the conclusion that the duty to be collected from mining machinery imported into this State, instead of being £127,703, would probably amount to £62,600. The duty actually collected last year under the State Tariff was £30,892. I am at one with the hon. member when he says that the mining machinery manufactured in the Commonwealth will increase in price closely up to the amount of the additional duty. I know that theoretically, as far as protection is concerned—and I do not want to enter into that controversy on this occasion—competition will or should keep down the price; but the mover has pointed out that the Australian States are not in a position, and are not likely to be for some years in a position, to produce all the mining machinery which this State will require and which frequently we want as quickly as possible when it is required. I say that the possibility is that those companies which are manufacturing mining machinery in Australia will take the fullest advantage of the tariff, and that the price of machinery will increase accordingly. In effect we shall, as he says, be paying to the Commonwealth manufacturers a larger amount for mining machinery than under present conditions. It must not be lost sight of that this tariff has not yet passed the Federal Parliament; and that is why I am supporting the motion, in order that if we can we may show to the other side that a cruel wrong will be done to this State by the imposition of these heavy duties on mining machinery. If they persist in keeping on these duties, the mine-owner will have to say to the wage-earner, "We find it necessary to reduce your wages." That will be the position, practically; and it is always an awkward position for an employer to be in, when he feels obliged to reduce wages, because the workers will resent the reduction. Seeing that these increases will cause a rise in the price of mining machinery, and will increase the cost of living in this State, I say we must make as far as possible the producing power of the wages earned in this State greater than

at present, by removing the food duties under our State Tariff. It is no good complaining of the "mote" in the eye of the Federal Parliament, and still allowing the "beam" to remain in our own eye. If we are going to protest against the high duties that affect the working of the mines in this State, we must also protest strongly about the continuance of the high duties which affect the cost of living in this community. What is sauce for the employer in that respect should be sauce for the employee, when it affects his pocket. We are told, by the only protectionist representative we sent to the Federal Parliament, that we have had in this colony a free breakfast table; and that is possibly one of the funniest things he has ever said. How can it be said we have a free breakfast table when we have a duty of 2d. a pound on cheese, 2d. on butter, 2d. on bacon, 2d. a dozen on eggs, 2d. a pound on hams, and 30s. a ton on flour? We find that the total of those duties on breakfast table articles collected in this State last year amounted to £129,000; yet we are told we have a free breakfast table! I contend that in the event of our having to face this Federal Tariff, and granting that mine-owners will reduce wages and that this Federal Tariff will bring into the State Treasury £150,000, it will be wise that we should follow this to its root, and say that as the mine-owners are going to reduce wages to the extent of £150,000 in the year, consequently the Treasury will be richer to the extent of £150,000 of duty collected, therefore we must reduce the food duties to the extent of £150,000, so that the workers shall not be in a worse position if the Federal Tariff is carried into force. Practically that is the position. I do not want to see the Federal Tariff imposed, but I say that all through the federal campaign I was against the two duties having to be borne at the same time. I pointed out that the sliding scale would not live for twelve months, as soon as the people found that they would have to pay for the sliding scale in addition to paying for the Federal Tariff. We federalists could see that revenue would have to be raised by the Commonwealth; and we said that consequently these duties under the sliding scale of this State must come off. If that is so,

I say we must take off the food duties, and I will gladly support anyone who proposes to take that course. The only thing I said, when we were passing the reimposition of the State Tariff, was that it should be passed in consequence of pledges made during the federation campaign; but now that we see the tariff, I say we can at least take off those duties which some of the producers in this country now say are no protection to them at all. We can well take the duty off cheese, butter, flour, eggs, bacon, and hams; for I believe that, with the possible exception of flour, the importations of all these other foodstuffs have increased during the last year, and consequently, we are merely using them as a means of easily collecting a revenue. If we were to tax the people in a more direct way, they would take a greater interest in the direct expenditure of the Government; and when any man approached the Treasurer and tried to obtain money from him for an expenditure on this or that object, the Treasurer would be brought face to face with the fact that if he were to grant the money for those works which are not works of necessity, then the people would have to be taxed directly for those works. I do not want to see any addition to the heavy duties now collected, nor do I want the Treasurer to receive an additional amount far greater than he or we anticipated, in order that at the end of the year he may say, "I am a true prophet, for I prophesied that I should have a surplus of £3,000 at the end of this financial year, and now I have got £250,000." That is a kind of thing everyone should try to stop. Therefore I have much pleasure in supporting this motion, merely to show that this State is practically, whether we like it or not, a State of free-traders; and consequently, having sent 10 out of 11 free-trade representatives to the Federal Parliament, we have a right to say to those who are engaged in the framing of the tariff, that it will inflict an inexcusable wrong on the greatest industry we have in this State, if the Federal Tariff be carried in its present form.

As 6:30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

MR. J. L. NANSON (Murchison): I should not have been found speaking in this debate at an early stage, but for the fact that it is my intention, before I sit down, to move an amendment to the motion; and it may be convenient for members of the House, in arriving at a decision on the question, if they have before them not only the motion, but the amendment I propose to submit. We are indebted to the member for Coolgardie for a most interesting speech, and after listening to it, all of us must regret that we do not oftener hear that hon. member in this House. We must also listen to anything that the hon. member says in relation to the mining industry, not only with the greatest amount of attention, but also with the greatest amount of respect, because we must recognise that probably there is no man in the House who has a closer knowledge of the industry and has its welfare more sincerely at heart, and who would be more loth to consent to anything that would injure it or interfere with its progress, than the hon. member. I have no doubt also that this motion and the interesting speech which the hon. member delivered on it will prove to be the precursor of an equally interesting debate. Though the debate may be interesting, I am utterly unable to see how a motion of the kind that the House is asked to commit itself to can lead to any valuable or practical result. Let us consider for a moment what this motion asks the House to commit itself to. Whatever the intention of the mover may be, there can be no question that outside Western Australia, in the Eastern States, in the Parliament of the Commonwealth, this motion, if carried by this House, will be regarded as a direct vote of no-confidence by the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia in the Barton Ministry. I can hardly see we are justified in carrying a motion of so sweeping a character, simply because this tariff, which is intended not for Western Australia alone, with its small population of 190,000 people, but which is intended for the Commonwealth as a whole, with a population considerably over four millions. I cannot see how we can expect a tariff which is intended to apply to the whole of Australia could be of such a nature that we could not pick

holes in it, and could not find faults in it, and some faults of a very serious description. It is impossible to frame a tariff for the whole of Australia which will equally please every State in Australia, or equally please all the people or the divergent interests of the Commonwealth. We might as well endeavour to frame a tariff without blemish or spot, as to find the sun without spots; we might as well endeavour to search for the philosopher's stone or the elixir of life, as to find a tariff to answer the demands of every interest and every industry of every State in an absolutely equal degree. A tariff to apply to the Commonwealth as a whole must necessarily be in the nature of a compromise. It has to find not only a large revenue for the needs of the States of the Commonwealth, but it has to do something to protect the industries of the Commonwealth. The member for Coolgardie told us in the course of his speech that the promulgation of this tariff had no reference whatever to the cause of federation; but if we go back to the time when the battle of federation was being fought, if we go back to the time prior to the taking of the referendum, we know perfectly well that no advocate of federation would have dared to get up then and tell the people of Australia that we were going into a Federal Constitution that would give us a free-trade tariff for Australia. And the reason why no Australian orator of any standing at that time tried to take up that attitude, is sufficiently evident. We know, if the federation orators of New South Wales had enlarged on the subject of protection at that period, if they had told us that the tariff of the Commonwealth would be a free-trade tariff, it would have absolutely prevented Victoria from joining. That great State of Victoria consented to enter into the federation only with the confident belief that federation meant a continuance of the protective policy which had done so much for that State—small in area but great in riches—that it would mean continuance of that policy which has done so much, not only for Victoria, but even for the mother-State of New South Wales; of a nature which has done so much for the State of Queensland, and for the State of South Australia; and which, I venture to say, has done very much for the State of

Western Australia as well.—[MEMBER: Where?]
—I have already indicated that this tariff will no doubt have to undergo some farther material alterations; but the consideration I would put to this House is this: is it desirable that when we have to deal with a Federal Tariff we should look at it in an unfederal spirit? Are we to look at the question merely as the State of Western Australia, or (dealing with federal matters) as Australians as a whole? Nothing astonished me more than the fact that gentlemen who before federation had been consummated, used to tell us so much about "one flag and one destiny," as soon as they get a tariff which does not altogether suit their book, as soon as they get a tariff that is too much protective and not sufficiently free-trade, all at once they forget everything apparently that they said about "one flag and one destiny"—[MR. HOPKINS: Not a bit of it!]
—and ask us to look at this great question in a narrow and provincial light, and not to look at it as Australians but as members of a single State of Australia. That is, I contend, a narrow ground to take; it is a ground which, personally, I do not regard as an acceptable one; but it is a ground that finds acceptance with a large number of members in this House, a large number of people of Western Australia, who at one time were ardent federalists; and I will endeavour to follow them, and look at the matter through their spectacles. But I ask hon. members to consider whether the motion, if passed, will assist in any way to attain the object they have in view. Let us take into consideration one fact of which mention has not been made. We have representing our interests at the present time in the Federal Ministry, the greatest West Australian of us all. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] We have in the Federal Ministry Sir John Forrest, who, with his own personality, with his own right hand, is, I venture to say, probably able to do more for Western Australia than all the other members we have sent to represent this State. [Several interjections.] Perhaps, as the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) says, Sir John Forrest is not so great a man as some of us in this House imagine him to be; but we have to look at the world-wide reputation of Sir John Forrest, we

have to look at the reputation he bears in the other States, we have to look at the reputation he bears in the mother country; and whatever stand may be taken in this House in regard to the motion, I for one, even if in doing so I am alone, shall refuse to subscribe to what in the Eastern States and in the Commonwealth Parliament will be interpreted as a direct vote of no-confidence in Sir John Forrest. I venture to say, at this day there is no man to whom, if he came back amongst us, the hearts and the faith of the people would go out more than to Sir John Forrest. [Several interjections.] In moving my amendment, I have no desire to raise the question of protection or free-trade. For that reason my amendment adopts a form which is, comparatively speaking, colourless. [Interjections and laughter.] It reads thus:—

[That this House] confident in the desire and the determination of the Federal Parliament to conserve and advance the best interests of the Commonwealth, leaves to it the consideration of the Australian tariff.

That, instead of conveying a vote of no-confidence in the Barton Ministry, like the motion of my friend the member for Coolgardie, amounts to a vote of confidence in the Federal Parliament. Will this House say it is not ready to pass a vote of confidence in the Federal Parliament? Is it prepared to say that, having agreed to enter into federation, it has no confidence in the Parliament of its own creation? Surely if the House refuse to pass an amendment of this description, it proves itself, as representing the people of this State, to be opposed to the Parliament of the Commonwealth, to be lacking in confidence in that Parliament, and lacking in confidence in the people of Australia as a whole. A great deal has been made by the member for Coolgardie of the fact that the new Federal Tariff means a large increase in the cost of living. Why, I ask, did the people of the goldfields not recognise that fact before they voted?

[Several interjections.]

MEMBER: They thought they were to get a free-trade tariff.

MR. HOPKINS: They voted before the tariff was promulgated.

MR. NANSON: An hon. member says that the people thought they were going

to have a free-trade tariff. That is precisely the admission I wanted to get; and for a very good reason. When the motion of no-confidence in connection with the Federal Tariff was being debated in the Federal Parliament the other day, Mr. Barton, in referring to this cry that the tariff increased the cost of living, drew attention to the fact that it is absolutely necessary to have a high tariff. And whom did Mr. Barton on that occasion quote as his authority for the statement? The authority was no other than the right hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, and who moved the no-confidence motion in question. Mr. Barton pointed out that, speaking in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly on the 21st February, 1899—[MEMBER: That is a long time back]—Mr. Reid said there was bound to be a very high tariff, which was the price New South Wales was to pay for federation. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] That utterance, as Mr. Barton went on to say, is sufficient to shatter the suggestion that the Commonwealth can have a low tariff, or what is ordinarily known as a revenue tariff. Now these facts were known to the people on the goldfields before the referendum was taken. The assertion was reiterated again and again by a small band of adherents of a lost cause in this State, that federation must increase the cost of living. And again and again, not once only, but many times, that assertion was met, not with argument but with flat contradiction. It was contended that Federation meant, not an increase in the cost of living, but a decrease in the cost of living. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] For my own part, though I like to be sympathetic, I feel it difficult to conjure up much sympathy for the people of the goldfields in the mess into which they have got themselves and, unfortunately, this State. I may feel a certain amount of sympathy for the people of the goldfields; because, after all, the people were undoubtedly misled by their leaders.

Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: What about the vote in Perth?

MR. NANSON: A vote in favour of Federation was cast in Perth; but had it not been for the knowledge that the

goldfields were going solid for federation, we would certainly have secured an adverse vote in Perth.

Several MEMBERS: No.

MR. GEORGE: There was misrepresentation.

MR. NANSON: What we in Perth were faced with was this, that if the people on the coast recorded a vote adverse to Federation and the goldfields vote were wholly and unanimously in favour of Federation, the effect would be to split Western Australia into two sections—[Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.]—and that evils worse even than those of Federation, would ensue. That was why Federation was carried in this State, because the hand of the people on the coast was forced by the people on the goldfields.

MR. GEORGE: And by English blood-money.

MR. NANSON: I am coming to that now. I am glad the hon. member mentioned it. I said it was difficult for me to conjure up sympathy for the people on the goldfields; but I withdraw the remark, because I recognise those people acted for the best and were misled. A section of the community for which I feel no sympathy, however, is those London companies who intervened, and intervened most unjustifiably, in the federal campaign. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Those companies intervened by finding money, by finding a sum of £1,000 in order to force federation on the people of this State.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: Three thousand pounds.

MR. NANSON: A sum of £3,000, was it? That makes the case three times worse. Let us ask ourselves what was the object of the London companies when they contributed the sum of £3,000 in order to force federation on us.

MEMBER: To get free-trade.

MR. NANSON: We all know what their object was. They, with their slight and superficial knowledge of Australian conditions, had somehow or other got into their heads the idea that federation meant not only cheaper living, but also lower wages. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] They went even farther than that. They thought federation would enable them to lower the wages of the working men of this State. They thought

federation would act as it has acted in the United States, would impose a highly conservative form of Government, which would block the demands of the Labour party. Of course, I know they were absolutely and utterly wrong. I know that had they taken the trouble to study the Federal Constitution with any degree of closeness they would have realised that it was the most democratic constitution the world had ever seen. They thought that a highly centralised Government, away somewhere in Sydney or Melbourne, would not be open to labour pressure from this side of the continent. In some mysterious way, because they did not recognise that labour troubles can be settled without the intervention of the Federal Government, they thought that a highly centralised Government would be able to bring pressure to bear on labour organisations here, and to keep the aspirations of those organisations in check. Hence those companies subscribed the sum of £3,000, and now they are in the position of the engineer who is "hoist with his own petard." They acknowledge now what they refused to acknowledge before, that the local tariff, that tariff with which the name of Sir John Forrest will be for ever honourably associated—[Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear]—had several good points after all; that it did not impose such heavy burdens on industry as some hon. members have tried to persuade us it did; that it was a tariff under which it was possible to live; and that it is possible to have a tariff which does not suit the interests of the State to an equal degree. I suggest that the House, instead of expressing at this stage an opinion on the tariff, leave the various chambers of commerce and of manufactures and similar bodies to make representations to those members of the Federal Parliament who represent Western Australia. That is the usual course, and the normal course; and hon. members are much more likely to achieve a modification of the tariff in the direction they desire if, instead of supporting a motion which is practically a blow in the eye to the Barton Government, and a blow at Sir John Forrest personally, representations are made in the usual, and normal, and constitutional way, by bringing pressure to bear on our representatives in the Federal Parliament.

MR. HIGHAM: We are doing so.

MR. NANSON: Let us suggest in what direction we want the tariff modified. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham) tells us that such representations are being made; and I am glad of it, because that is the right course to take. I know that where representations have been made by a chamber of commerce in that way to Mr. Barton, the Federal Prime Minister, a reply has been received that the question is receiving the attention of the Federal Government. [Several MEMBERS: Oh!] Of course, a reply of that kind raises a smile from the Labour bench; because its occupants have had some experience of what the reply amounts to when received from certain gentlemen now on our Treasury bench. But such a reply in the case of the Federal Government is not an empty form. Moreover, the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures would not be acting alone in this matter. It would be acting in concert with chambers of commerce and manufactures throughout the Commonwealth. There is no reason whatever why the chambers of commerce and manufactures in this State should not take concerted action with similar chambers in other parts of the Commonwealth. Our Chamber of Mines might co-operate with other chambers of mines, if there be any in other parts of Australia. There is no reason why they should not equally join in making their representations to the Federal Parliament. I do not wish to contend for a moment that the duties on mining requisites might not with advantage be amended in some particulars. Generally speaking, however, we cannot escape from the conclusion that this tariff follows what I, as a protectionist, at any rate regard as the sound rule of seeing that the mining industry is used as a sort of fulcrum or lever in order to establish permanent industries in our midst. Let us look at the question in this way. We know that the mining industry cannot remain here for ever: sooner or later it must come to an end. Sooner or later, however immense the stores of gold in the soil of this country may be, sooner or later those stores will be exhausted, and we shall have to look to something else for our prosperity, to something else to keep our people employed. If the figures quoted by the member for

Coolgardie be correct, that only five per cent. of the mining companies are making any profit, and the other 95 per cent. of the mines are working at a loss, it may not be a matter of centuries, but perhaps of half a century at the most. Assuming, however, that it should be a matter of centuries, then I say we have not only to think of our immediate concerns, but we have to think of our children and those who will come after us; and we have to unite in helping to build up in Western Australia industries which will give employment to every section of the community. The hon. member has told us that under the Federal Tariff many of the mines will be wiped out of existence; therefore if 95 per cent. of the mines are already working at a loss, I do not know that the position will be very much worse by reason of the tariff. But what has surprised and pained me is that the mover should have joined the ranks of the pessimists. The other night it was my pleasing duty to congratulate the Colonial Treasurer on having joined the ranks of the optimists; but I can conceive no gentleman who corresponds to the character of the optimist more than the member for Coolgardie, who looks the very embodiment of contentment; therefore I suggest that he should change places with the Colonial Treasurer and rank among the optimists, while the Colonial Treasurer ranks among the pessimists. We have heard a great deal about the burden which this tariff imposes on the mining industry; but does this burden approximate to the burden which has been imposed on mining by company promoters in London? Has not that system of company promoting been to a great extent the reason why so many mining companies in this State are at the present time unable to pay their way? Is it not a fact that in a great number of instances, the enormous over-capitalisation of mining properties has made it impossible for those properties to return a profit to the shareholders and at the same time pay working expenses? I must confess that, though not speaking with the experience of the member for Coolgardie, and making the confession for what it is worth, I say if the mining industry of this State is ever to be a national industry and to provide the greatest possible amount of benefit to the

people in the State, it will not be by the aid of the great mining companies, but it will be by the aid of that admirable system which the present Minister for Mines is doing his best to advance, that of providing public batteries and cyanide plants on the goldfields of this State; so that the men who work the mines will not be under the necessity of going to England and floating for enormous sums the properties they are striving to hold, but that they will have an opportunity of getting their ore crushed, and in that way the men who actually discovered the mines will be those who will get the benefit of working them. It is a moot point as to the value of English capital, despite the immense amount of good it has done here, whether taking one thing with another you will find it has not also inflicted almost an equal amount of evil. When we think of the scandals resulting from the operations of company promoters in London, when we think of the ill repute which our gold resources are brought into by these scandals, while giving every credit that is due to the introduction of foreign capital, it is impossible to deny that we have not had to pay very heavy prices for that capital, in many instances. We will have reason to bless this Federal Tariff if it make mining in this State more of a national and local industry, and less of an industry in the hands of the company promoter and the absentee owner. I do not desire to go into that huge, vast, and unfathomable question of free-trade and protection: it can lead to no good to have an interminable debate on the merits and demerits of these two rival fiscal systems; therefore I will make no attempt to follow the line of argument taken up by the member for Coolgardie in regard to what free-trade has done for New South Wales and what protection has done for Victoria. I do not desire to discuss the tariff in detail, nor to raise a long debate which cannot have any useful or practical result, however interesting it may be to us individually. As a protectionist, I see no reason to object that this Federal Tariff is protective in its incidence, so far as the financial needs of the States and of the Commonwealth will permit; but there would be indeed cause for lamentation were it based on the economic sophistries

of the free-trade doctrinaires. If we know the tendencies that are dominating the political thought and action throughout the Commonwealth to-day, we are irresistibly compelled to the conclusion that as Australia is protective in her internal and her social legislation, so also she must be protective in her commerce with the outside world. The tariff recognises this principle. I do not for one moment contend that the tariff is perfect in every particular; but what I do assert is that within the four corners of this tariff you will find the germ of a wise statesmanship and a courageous policy that will give to Australia permanent and growing prosperity; a policy that will enable us to attain our highest ideals; a policy that will raise us to the very apex of nationhood. Accept it, and we continue in the path of progress: reject it, and we condemn ourselves to a lower plane of existence. Accept it, and we give to our people the fullest field for the exercise of their abilities, their industry, and their talents: reject it, and we confine them to a few elementary industries, and we close to them the door of some of the most elevating and useful spheres of human enterprise and endeavour. Accept it, and we affirm our faith in the unnumbered potentialities of our country: reject it, and we stand condemned before the world as a nation that is neither confident in itself nor ashamed of its own cowardice. It has been stated that what spells advance to other parts of Australia spells retrogression to ourselves. I leave such misgivings to the dreamy and weak-kneed fanaticism of those who believe Western Australia has no better fate, no worthier ambition, than the mining camp and the sheepwalk; who believe that not for us are the blessings of agriculture and the wider culture that springs from manufacturing industries. So far from sharing in those narrow views, I have faith in our country, faith in our people, faith in their genius, faith in their manifest destiny. The ideal of those who condemn this tariff is not for what is best, but for what costs the least. They think no sacrifice too great, so long as they are pursuing and practising the cardinal principle of their economic faith—the deification of cheapness, of cheap goods, of cheap wages, and of cheap living. A protective

policy will strengthen and develop the national character, and will make it unyielding to the shallow pleas of depreciation or the blandishments of the new sun of prosperity. A protective policy, it has been well said, embodies a system that gives strength to the citizen and stability to the State. In a matter of so much moment, no portion of the Commonwealth can afford to halt between two opinions. If we decide to fetter our aspirations and set limits to our endeavours, we cannot hope to prove an exception to all experience of enlightened communities; but ours will be the lot of those who place their dependence on one industry, on one source of wealth, neglecting or sacrificing other sources and other means of employment which should be available to a community. If, on the other hand, we decide not to foster a fancied one industry at the expense of every other, but to encourage and to assist all those industries for which our country and our people are adapted, then we shall be laying the foundation of an edifice which will worthily embody our character as a people, and on which the waves of adversity will dash themselves in vain.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake): After the burst of eloquence and the flight into the realms of fancy of the member for the Murchison, and in order to prevent myself from soaring to those giddy heights, I say in the words of a modern author, "Chops and tomato sauce!" (Laughter.) The hon. member has convinced us of one thing, and it is this: a renunciation of the ideas he held during the federation campaign. Then I understand the hon. member posed as a strong anti-federalist; but when we find, this evening, that he speaks of the policy of the present Federal Government as one which will carry us to the very apex of nationhood, I conceive he is now a converted federalist of the very highest order. So far as that is concerned, I congratulate the hon. member. But this evening it is no concern of mine to discuss the merits or demerits of federation, nor does the fact that the Federal Government have proposed a particular tariff for Australia cause me to waver in the slightest degree in my adherence to federation. I am still a federalist, and should be whatever the tariff might be, because I consider the

tariff, whatever it may be, a mere incident in the career of federation, though it is an incident which undoubtedly will affect the whole of Australian citizenship. And particularly am I entitled, as other members are entitled, to regard the question from the point of view of how it affects the State interests. Whilst of course we are imbued with the general idea that the policy of any Federal Government must be for the benefit of Australia as a whole, we cannot, so long as we remain politicians and men, resist the temptation to criticise adversely that which touches us personally as individuals and as a State, as this question of the Federal Tariff does. And I say at once, therefore, that I intend to support the member for Coolgardie in his original motion, and I am opposed to the amendment of the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson). I do not think the member for Coolgardie brought this motion forward with the idea that this House should arrogate the right to declare no confidence in the Barton Ministry.

MR. MORGANS: Not at all.

THE PREMIER: If that were the hon. member's view, I should not support the motion, or I should add some words that would take away from the motion such an unnecessary sting. But the member for the Murchison frankly avers that this motion is one of no-confidence.

MR. NANSON: I said it would be accepted as such.

THE PREMIER: And frankly admits that his intention in moving his amendment is to express absolute confidence in the Federal Government.

MR. NANSON: The Federal Parliament.

MR. TAYLOR: Sir John Forrest.

THE PREMIER: I understand, in the Federal Ministry, and, as the hon. member says, in Sir John Forrest.

MR. NANSON: The Federal Parliament is mentioned in the amendment: it does not mention the Federal Government.

THE PREMIER: I am not questioning the mere wording of the motion.

MR. NANSON: You have to vote on the amendment, or against it.

THE PREMIER: I am going to vote against it, and I am going to vote against it because I do not believe in it: that is the chief reason. The general tenour of the hon. member's remarks was that this amendment would declare the confidence

of this House, to all intents, in the Federal Ministry. If the hon. member says that was not his intention, I will say no more on that point.

MR. NANSON: No; it is not. It is my intention to vote in the terms of the amendment.

THE PREMIER: Perhaps I and other members who think with me have drawn a wrong inference from the observations of the hon. member, and that is very constantly the case when we are debating questions in the House. That is no reason why we should not give vent to the ideas running in our minds. I do not, as I said, propose to discuss the merits of federation, or the necessity for maintaining the sliding scale. Those are questions outside the present motion. Whether I admit or not the very great power of Sir John Forrest, or the magnitude of his reputation, that also is beside the question. Hon. members who have studied the debates of the last five or six years will know that I was not always in accord with the right hon. gentleman; and I do not desire to aim a blow at the right hon. gentleman, nor do I think it necessary to drag his name unnecessarily into this debate, either for the purpose of censure or for the purpose of praise. But Sir John Forrest claims to himself, I notice by the telegraphic reports in the daily newspapers, credit for having established, in this State during his career, a free breakfast table. I cannot admit that, though I do recognise the fact that, perhaps with that object in view he removed the duties from tea, sugar, and from fencing wire. I have, I say, as a member of this House, a perfect right to discuss this tariff as it affects the State. If we take the *personnel* of our representatives in the Senate and the Lower House of the Federal Parliament, you will find we sent there all free-traders with the exception of one — perhaps one other may have been half-hearted. I believe Senator De Largie was a protectionist. That is abundant proof that the paramount feeling in this State was in favour of free-trade. If not in favour of free-trade, at any rate against this ultra-protection which now prevails, and which has prevailed for many years in the neighbouring State of Victoria. And if a compromise was at any moment in con-

templation, it was that either the free-trade or the protectionist party should give way—that both should give way to a certain extent—and that there should be a revenue tariff. I have not heard anybody yet declare their honest belief that the proposed Federal Tariff is a revenue tariff. Nor do the Ministers of the Federal Parliament claim to themselves that this is a revenue tariff. They have exulted in the idea that they have brought forward a protective tariff, and they intend to stand or fall by it. The member for Coolgardie has pointed out how it will affect, in his opinion adversely, many of the interests of this State, and I agree with nearly everything the hon. member has said; and that being so, I feel it is peculiarly within my province as leader of the Government here, and representing a certain number of people and the trend of political thought, to express my views on this great question, with the idea not only of assisting to guide the opinions of our own people, but of assisting our representatives in the Federal Parliament to resist the imposition of these high protective duties. That is the chief object we should all have in view. If in Parliament and in our own electorates we are in a position to carry resolutions by large majorities, and thus to affirm the enthusiasm of the people and to declare emphatically that they are opposed to this tariff, then we shall no doubt materially assist those who represent us in Melbourne and who will be called on to cast their votes for or against this measure. If we show a lukewarmness or a half-heartedness in the consideration of the matter here, where we are supposed to more accurately judge public opinion, we perhaps cannot blame our representatives if they vote in the wrong direction, because they are justly entitled to say, "If your feelings were so strong, why did you not take means to express them and convey them to us, so that we could the more emphatically express the opinions of those whom we represent, by our votes?" And more especially is it necessary for us to strengthen the hands of our Senators. It should be remembered the Senators in the Federal Parliament represent, not sections of the community, but the people of the State as one electorate, as one big voting body;

and if therefore we express an opinion adverse to the Federal Tariff, we strengthen the hands of each individual Senator to such an extent that he will be forced to fight as hard as he can in order to advance not only his own views, but the views he well knows are entertained by his electorate. Inasmuch as the Senate represents the States by equal representation, therefore it is there the smaller States—and we are one of the smaller or less populous States—can make their voice heard and where their votes will carry the greatest weight. Consequently, it is due to us, by every legitimate effort, to render the greatest possible assistance and encouragement to our Senators to induce them to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government, and prevent them doing what we believe, and I think what they will admit, is an injustice to the people of this State. But whatever we do must be done in a respectful and in a proper manner; and nobody, however adverse his views may be to the principle propounded by the member for Coolgardie, can say this motion is couched in anything but the most respectful language; and it can go forth, I hope, as an expression of opinion of the elected members of this State, representing all parts of the State and all shades of political opinion. I shall therefore support the motion, and urge members on both sides of the House to do the same. It is no party question whatever: it is one of general application. I do not even know what views my colleagues entertain on the subject, and I shall not feel aggrieved if I find any of them voting against me on this question. We are here, not as representing any petty little party politics, but struggling with one of the biggest problems and ideas that has yet engaged the attention of Australasia; therefore I approach this question with all deference and with all respect, but still strong in the belief that I am advocating the right cause, and justified in appealing to members to support the motion.

MR. H. DAGLISH (Subiaco): I should not have spoken this evening, but it appears to me that an attempt has been made to make this a question of free-trade against protection. I rise, as a protectionist, to give my adherence to the motion of the member for Coolgardie,

because I do not think in any way the motion is aimed at the protective nature of the tariff that has been introduced. But, as far as I have been able to gather, these very words, without consideration of their niceties of meaning, are very often made battle-cries, while the real differences between the contending parties are very slight indeed. I remember years ago, in Victoria, the home of protection in Australia, there was a great battle, in which all those who advocated 25 per cent. duties were alleged by those in the community who called themselves protectionists to be nothing short of free-traders. It was held that the men who advocated moderate protective duties of 25 per cent. were absolute free-traders. As a matter of fact, one of the main points against this tariff, in my opinion, is that it is not a protective tariff to a very large extent, but has the worst features of a free-trade tariff, in that it casts the revenue duties on the necessities of everyday life. In regard to protection, we have to consider that its main object is to nurture infant industries. The mining machinery industry is one which has been in existence in Victoria, close to the mining industry itself, for the last 40 years. It has enjoyed all the advantages of protection in that State for no less a period than 40 years; and surely if protection is ever to build up industries in the fashion which the member for the Murchison has so glowingly described, surely in 40 years some strength should have been imparted to the mining machinery industry in the State of Victoria. [Mr. MORGANS: Hear, hear.] As a matter of fact, Victoria still has, and South Australia still has, an enormous advantage in competing with England and the United States for the Western Australian market. Victoria and South Australia have the enormous advantage of distance, and the consequent great saving in freight. These two States have farther had the advantage of being during all these years close to the main gold-producing districts of the world, of being part of the main gold-producing country of the world. I contend, therefore, that if this industry can be built up by protection at all, it must have been built up before the present day. I rose, however, not for the purpose of saying much in justification of the

motion; because the member for Coolgardie practically said all that needed saying. He demonstrated fully, I think, the necessity from the mining man's point of view of carrying such a motion as this. It has been urged by the member for the Murchison that we should leave it to chambers of manufacturers, chambers of commerce, and chambers of mines to pass resolutions in regard to the tariff. But these various bodies represent only a few classes of the community: they do not represent the mass of the people. [Mr. HOPKINS: Hear, hear.] We in this House represent the great body of the people; and I contend that nothing can be more plainly our duty than, if we think the interests of the State are at stake, to speak at once, and with no uncertain sound. As a matter of fact, the motion is aimed not at the tariff as a whole, but merely at one or two of its items; and we are not expressing, if we carry the motion, any vote of want of confidence in the present Federal Administration. We are not doing that; but if we carry the amendment which has been proposed, we are practically saying that we are perfectly satisfied with the tariff as it stands at the present time. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] A motion has been proposed attacking the tariff; and if an amendment of any description on that motion be carried, then this House, in carrying the amendment, is virtually endorsing the whole of the tariff as promulgated by the Barton Ministry. I urge members to hesitate, and to hesitate for a long time, before they take so momentous a step. The member for the Murchison argued that if the tariff would make mining more of a local industry, it would not be doing harm. I am inclined to support the motion proposed by the member for Coolgardie because I think the tariff will have exactly the contrary effect: I think it will make mining an industry which will require a greater amount of capital than it requires at the present time. The difficulty of winning the gold from the earth is already very great; and the amount of costly mining machinery required is especially great in Western Australia, because of the number of refractory ores which have to be contended with. If we add to the cost of that machinery by

imposing a heavy duty, if we raise the price of it by the operation of the tariff, we shall naturally restrict the number who can engage in mining, and we shall make it necessary for mining companies to be even more heavily capitalised than they are at the present time. I contend that instead of encouraging the establishment of local industries, the operation of this tariff will be to make it far more difficult to establish local companies than it has been in the past. The member for the Murchison urged us to view the question as Australians, and not from the selfish standpoint of citizens of an individual State. But I ask the members of this House whether the people in the other States are looking at the question as Australians, or looking at it from the same point of view as ourselves? Why has the tariff in its present form been propounded? Why are the Victorian members in the House of Representatives according it such strong support? Is it not because they recognise that it will build up the manufactures, not of Western Australia, but of Victoria, because they recognise that it will encourage the establishment of new industries, not in Western Australia, but in Victoria?

MR. RESIDE: In Australia.

MR. DAGLISH: And we find that the tariff—

MR. RESIDE: Victoria is Australia.

MR. DAGLISH: Victoria is part of Australia; and we have to consider that here in this State we have a much larger part of Australia, whose interests are likewise to be conserved. It is our duty, not only from the local point of view, but from the Australian point of view, to build up our own particular State, and to conserve the interests of our particular State. For if there be on the Western side of the continent a large area of country sparsely populated or hardly populated at all, it will form an absolute menace to the whole of the Eastern States. If, for instance, at any time in the future, the people of Australia are dragged into some international complication which results in war, and we then have in Western Australia a country almost unpopulated, to which an enemy can therefore gain ready admittance, and we have farther, in the meantime constructed the transcontinental line, our lack of population, our weakness, will be

an element of great danger to the Eastern States. I therefore urge that in the interests of the whole of Australia it is necessary to build up here as thriving, as populous, and as prosperous a community as possible. We must conserve the mining industry as well as our other natural industries. At the same time, I trust that those sections of the tariff which will help to build up some of what are called artificial industries will likewise be conserved. But I urge the House to pass the motion proposed by the member for Coolgardie not only in the interests of the mining community, but in the interests of the people in the coastal districts, who are largely dependent for their own welfare and prosperity on the welfare and prosperity of the mining districts. We can never hope to establish those artificial industries which the member for the Murchison is so anxious to see established, unless we have within the State some market for their products; and so, if we are to have prosperous manufacturing industries established in Perth and Fremantle, and the surrounding district, we must have a goldfields population providing a market for those industries. In the interests, therefore, of those industries which the hon. member and I, as protectionists, hope to see established, I shall certainly record a vote in favour of the motion.

MR. F. WILSON (Perth): I consider the motion of the member for Coolgardie a very proper one to bring before this Assembly, notwithstanding the eloquence of the member for the Murchison, who first declared that he did not wish to enter into the relative merits of free-trade and protection, and then wound up his speech by a peroration such as we seldom hear within the four walls of this building, exultingly claiming the advantages of protection for Western Australia. Notwithstanding that eloquence, I venture to think that this Assembly is sitting here to look after and protect to a great extent the particular industries of Western Australia. We are here to legislate for Western Australia; not for the Commonwealth; and I think we have an example very much in point in the history of another federated country, to wit, Canada. We find there that after federation was brought about, the State of British Columbia had debate after

debate in her local Parliament on federal matters which interested that State more particularly. The Parliament of British Columbia went so far, I believe, on one occasion, as not only to pass a vote of censure on the Dominion Government, but also to threaten forcible resistance to the laws, if the compact with itself were not carried out. Of course, I do not for a moment advocate such a course in this Assembly. We can debate matters which affect our interests and our prosperity in a calmer manner than that. If we pass the motion proposed by the member for Coolgardie, our action cannot have even the semblance of a threat, so far as the Federal Ministry are concerned. The motion is moderately worded, and simply indorses the views of the bulk of the members whom we have returned to the Federal Parliament. It indorses the views which were expressed at the time of the Federal elections in the early part of the present year. I venture to think that the motion, if passed, will have this effect, and this effect only—to strengthen the hands of our representatives in the Federal Parliament. It will bring prominently before the representatives of other States the opinion of the people of this State, as voiced by their representatives in this Assembly. It will show Mr. Barton, the Federal Premier, and his Ministers that the people of Western Australia are not satisfied with the Federal Tariff which has been promulgated; and by that means I hope it will be the cause of the tariff being modified to a very large extent. I want to point out that the member for the Murchison trenched on debatable ground, inasmuch as he not only entered fully, in his final remarks, into the question of protection and free-trade, but also made some very disparaging remarks with regard to federalists generally. He said no federalist would have dared to advocate a free-trade tariff—

MR. NANSON: I said no leading federalist.

MR. WILSON: The hon. member says, no leading federalist would have dared to advocate a free-trade tariff; but I think many leading federalists, not only in the other States but also in Western Australia, did advocate a tariff based on free-trade principles, did dare to advocate that tariff, and did dare to

fight the question out when the federal elections were being held to determine whom we should send to represent our views. It appears to me to be absolutely clear that this question of protective or revenue tariffs is one we must debate, not only here, but outside, in the various chambers of commerce and manufactures, or it amounts to this. So far as we in Western Australia are concerned, we have not up to the present established these artificial industries, these industries which have been built up, as in Victoria, by artificial means, but depend on our great natural industries; and the one main industry which the member for Coolgardie has dealt with so fully to-night, the gold-mining industry, is certainly the most important so far as we are concerned, being, as it is, the largest employer of labour and the greatest producer of wealth in its own direct manner; and not only that, but also the industry which maintains every other industry of our State, and thus gives an enormous amount of employment indirectly. I think we must consider this matter: we are perfectly within our rights in doing so; and we can go so far as to argue whether the protectionist tariff which has been introduced by the Barton Ministry is preferable in this connection, namely in respect of our mining industry, to a revenue tariff based, as we would like to see it based, on free-trade principles. I, for one, declare at once that I am in accord with the member for Coolgardie. I do not think the tariff, as put forth, will advance the great industry of mining in Western Australia; nor do I think that it will assist any of our other main natural industries. I will go a step farther, and say the tariff is certainly not in the interests of the general public of our State. I think with the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), that although there are federalists and anti-federalists in this Assembly—of course with the federalists predominating—we may all discuss this question, and may, whether federalists or anti-federalists, come to an absolutely unanimous decision to support this motion. And we may fairly do so, and oppose the tariff as promulgated by the Barton Ministry, because the question is not as to whether that tariff is going to affect the whole of the Commonwealth in a detrimental manner, but it is as to

whether the tariff is going to affect our industries and the welfare of our State detrimentally. In this connection I should like to say that I take strong exception to the jibes that have been thrown against federalists, and the attempt that has been made to place the responsibility of this tariff on those who advocated federation during the federation campaign in this State. The importance of federation is one which is far and away beyond any question of a customs tariff. We are proud as free-traders that federation has gone a long way towards those free-trade principles we have advocated, and I am speaking of those who think as I do on that question. We have swept away the customs barriers between the different States, and have made large strides in the direction of free-trade; therefore I say again that as free-traders or even as protectionists we may accept federation as an accomplished fact that is going to stand for all time, whereas the matter of a customs tariff is here to-day and may be gone to-morrow. We have the Barton tariff before us to-day, and perhaps in a few weeks or months we may have a re-tariff to consider; and whether we believe in free-trade or protection, whether the tariff will act in the interests of the State we represent or be detrimental to this State, I may say the question as to whether this is a revenue tariff or a protective tariff is one that is settled beyond doubt by the incidence of taxation as set forth in the tariff. No one can argue that a duty of 25 per cent. on mining machinery or a duty of 15 per cent. on agricultural implements can be considered a revenue duty. When we find that this mining machinery and these agricultural implements are manufactured to a large extent in the Eastern States, it must of necessity appeal to members that the result is to retard the importation of that class of machinery, in order that we may satisfy to a large extent the greed, I may term it, of the manufacturers in Victoria and in South Australia. That is the position, from my point of view. There are certain industries which have been established for many years, in Victoria especially; and, as was properly pointed out by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), these are industries which

have been in existence for some 30 or 40 years, and therefore cannot be considered as infant industries, but must be regarded as having grown old under the fostering protection of Victorian tariffs passed from time to time. And now that it is proposed by some of us that this protection should be removed, at any rate in regard to the duties on mining machinery and agricultural implements, then we shall have Victorian representatives rising almost in a body and protesting against the removal of those duties. Not only does it affect our mining representatives and agriculturists, but it also touches the timber industry and the pastoral industry. But it goes farther, for not only have we to suffer enormous duties, quadrupled so far as mining machinery in this State is concerned; but we have also those duties which are to be imposed on wearing apparel and the necessaries of life. From my point of view, the future so far as our people are concerned is going to be hard. I do not think the mover has exaggerated the position when he states that the cost of production will be increased enormously, and that the cost of living must of necessity be increased, and the result must be to retard the progress of our State. We have in this State almost a third of the whole area of the Commonwealth, an enormous heritage to develop; and surely it is a fit and proper subject for discussion in this Assembly, if we believe honestly that the effect of this tariff will be to retard the progress of this great portion of the Commonwealth. Surely it goes far beyond our own boundaries, for it is also in the interests of the other States that Western Australia should advance with the enormous wealth she has in her gold mines yet to be developed, and the immense employment which such development will give to labour in this State. It must of necessity appeal to the people of this State and in this Assembly, but it must also appeal to those who represent other States, that their progress and their advancement are wrapt up in the progress and advancement of Western Australia. I want briefly to remark, in regard to the protective tendency of the representatives of Victoria in the Federal Parliament, and notwithstanding the weak-kneed policy of some of those who profess free-trade leanings, that we have

a report of a wonderful meeting held in Melbourne last night, held in that enormous town-hall in the very centre of protection, and crowded from floor to ceiling, besides thousands of other people unable to gain admission; and we learn that so soon as the question was put at that meeting as to whether the people were in favour of this Barton tariff—[Mr. MORGANS: Before the addresses]—before a word had been spoken, there was an enormous and unanimous vote against the Barton tariff. This shows there is something wrong, without going into the details of the tariff. It shows that even the people of Victoria have learned that the protective policy they have adopted for the last 20 or 30 years in that State has not given the results they anticipated; and they have realised that the industries built up in the artificial protection of that State have not panned out as they were expected to do. In fact, those people now know that these industries have entered into a better life and a stronger position in New South Wales than they could possibly do in protective Victoria. Hence this expression of opinion by the people assembled in that gigantic meeting last night, an expression of opinion that must echo and re-echo throughout the States of the Commonwealth. I hope we will not be carried away from the matter under discussion by any argument as to whether we are free-traders or protectionists. The question is simply whether this tariff is in the best interests of our State; and I think we are not parochial in our ideas when we consider it from our standpoint, and when we endeavour to bring all the pressure we can to bear on those who represent us and on those who are in power in connection with federal matters. I hope the House will pass the motion unanimously, and that it will be passed on to the Federal Ministry and to every member of the Federal Parliament, so that they may know we have spoken as representatives of our people in this State with no uncertain voice, as to the effect that in our opinion this Federal Tariff will have on our industries.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS (Boulder): As briefly as possible, I wish to add a few words in support of the motion so ably moved by the member for Coolgardie; and in doing so I should like to bring

under the notice of the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) the glorious freedom which the people of this State enjoyed when they were blessed with the tariff promulgated by Sir John Forrest, and which pressed on the people to the extent of five guineas per head per annum, against one pound per head in New South Wales, and two pounds per head in Victoria; a tariff which drew in foodstuffs alone over one pound per head from the people; and yet that is a tariff which the hon. member tells us we ought to be proud of. On that point I do not agree with him. It is not necessary to discuss this motion at great length, for I take it that this House has already made up its mind as to what course it will take. The member for the Murchison, recognising that this House is the representative Chamber for discussing this question, prefers that the question shall be discussed by the Chambers of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures throughout this State. That of course would be the ideal tribunal to which protectionists would refer a question of this kind. For my own part, I say that manufacturers are the people who will support the tariff of Mr. Barton and Sir John Forrest; but at the same time, with all due respect to the hon. member, I think it would be better for him to direct his arguments not to the people who are going to live on protection, but to the people who expect to live on the policy of the tariff which the Barton Government have given effect to. I unhesitatingly give my support to the motion moved by the member for Coolgardie.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): I think the member for Boulder was somewhat unfair in assuming that if this matter was referred to the local Chamber of Manufactures, that body would take up the view enunciated by the member for the Murchison. I think the manufacturers of Western Australia, seeing that they have absolutely nothing to gain by the duty on machinery, would vote against the tariff. From my experience of chambers of manufactures, I think they look at things from their own standpoint, like the rest of us. I cannot take the view which the member for the Murchison asked us to take, to willingly sacrifice ourselves, as we have been doing in enriching the manufacturing section of

the community in the East. Every member who has spoken, except Mr. Hopkins, seems to consider it his duty to explain his position as a federalist. I will not do so at length; I will only say that since this tariff has been promulgated, it has been the habit of every person who has spoken and who was not previously a federalist to keep crying out "I told you so." They cannot resist the opportunity to tell us that two years ago when we were strong federalists, we all predicted that we should have cheaper food and cheaper living; but that is not within my recollection. I did not happen to be in Perth at that time. I was on the Eastern goldfields, and I remember a number of people spoke against federation, and they all had one song without exception. It was this, that if you enter federation you will have cheap food, which will be followed by cheap wages. Everywhere we heard that, so far as my experience goes. It is mainly those who at that time opposed federation that have been in the wrong, but the hour is too late to discuss that question. I believe the House will see the necessity for passing this motion, so well proposed by the member for Coolgardie. I should only like to explain briefly one or two points which the member for Coolgardie did not illustrate sufficiently in connection with mining. Firstly there was one thing which he partly explained. It is not a matter of helping or retarding a rich mine—I would wish the House to remember that you cannot kill a rich mine—which can always look after itself. No tariff is likely to kill a rich mine, but remember in every country a rich mine is an exception. In the case of a great majority of the mines it is doubtful whether they are payable or not. We have in this country a great many more people engaged in mining than what obtained a few years ago, and for this reason: we are now able to treat on the goldfields ore that will give from 6, 7, and up to 12 pennyweights. A few years ago we could not treat ores at a profit sufficient to pay expenses, giving under one ounce. In the future I believe we shall be able to treat ores giving a lower return: then a greater number of people will be employed on the goldfields. The member for the Murchison eloquently explained that there was a

doubt if English companies were a benefit to Western Australia or not. Personally I agree with his view of the matter; I have a very strong doubt about it; but on the other hand, as pointed out by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), if you add burdens to mines, you make mining dearer, and you put away any prospect you might have of establishing mining on a greater scale in Western Australia. As regards the question of the tax on machinery, I wish to emphasise one particular point. This is not a revenue tariff. If revenue were required, it seems to me absolutely certain we could get a much larger revenue from a 10 or 15 per cent. tariff than from a 25 per cent. tariff. A curious thing is that the tariff is not required. It has been frequently pointed out in the House that for the last 30 or 40 years the manufacturers of machinery in the other States have been protected, and now if there is anything in protection, we should expect the manufacturers could hold their own. During the last few years we have been getting from the Eastern States from 40 to 45 per cent. of the machinery for Western Australia. That shows that the people in the East, when absolutely on level terms with those of Great Britain, can hold their own, and have continued to increase the amount of machinery which they send to us. That shows to my mind conclusively that they have an advantage in any case. Although we might find fault with the inter-State duties, we cannot possibly increase the inter-State duties on machinery. At the present moment the duty is 5 per cent., and all of us expected that the tariff on machinery would have been 10 per cent. In that case the manufacturers of the East would have had a benefit over their English rivals of 5 per cent. After all the question, as put forward by the member for the Murchison, is simply whether the industry is to get an advantage, or the people engaged in the manufacturing industry are superior to those engaged in mining. There would be something in that if the member could show us that it is possible that those engaged in manufactures are better off, that they on an average have a bigger source of income, have a higher rate of remuneration than those engaged in mining, but curiously

enough the reverse is the case. In South Australia and Victoria, where mining machinery is mainly made, the rate of income of people engaged in those industries is lower than the wages received by those engaged in the mining industry. The rate of wages in England is comparatively good.

MR. HOPKINS: Better than here.

MR. HASTIE: I am not quite sure that it does not average more than what engineers receive here. The hon. member tells us glibly that mining is merely a temporary affair, and that it is necessary for us to build up manufactures. Suppose we had a lot of manufactures established in Western Australia and we had no mining here, what is there to manufacture? What trade could you get?

MR. HOPKINS: Shifting sand.

MR. HASTIE: Mining is not temporary; it has not been so in connection with the goldfields in Western Australia, except the temporary alluvial fields. We have in this country four or five times greater area of goldfields than in any other part of the world, and I believe it will be 200 years before anyone can say that our goldfields are exhausted or played out. To my mind mining is as permanent an industry as we can get. The member for the Murchison mentioned the figures which had been referred to by the member for Coolgardie. That out of the amount of ground on lease, only 5 per cent. is owned by companies paying dividends. I will go farther; if the companies paying dividends held reasonable areas the percentage would be smaller, but unfortunately several companies which are paying dividends have a larger area of ground beside them which they will not be able to touch for the next ten years. If the argument tells in any way at all, it does not tell in the way the member for the Murchison assumed. It tells in this way, the less mining ground that is used at the present, more is left. There are numbers of small companies and small parties, and they have pieces of ground which they are working at and finding remunerative. This tariff will tell not only on companies but on the wage earners. Not only on the wage earner, but there are a large number of people who do a good deal of work on their own account. In the future, if these men can

live at a comparatively cheap rate, they will be able to look over and develop new ground. It was said that if this protective tariff is adopted, very soon if not at present we shall be able to get all the machinery we want from the East. I do not think so. My own impression is that it is absolutely impossible for the manufacturers of the East for the next seven or ten years to supply us with the machinery which is required at present. Until that takes place we may expect to have in Western Australia a ring that will charge us to the very utmost for all the machinery required. Reference has been made here to the fact that we should do something for ourselves, that we should not be content to grumble at the Federal Government for imposing these duties seeing that we have it within our power to reduce all the items on the sliding scale. I will not discuss that question at present. Members will recollect that I gave notice of motion for the reduction of the principal articles of consumption on the tariff, and that motion will come on next Wednesday. I believe from the expression of opinion of most of the members, the motion will be carried. Farther we have a select committee sitting on the food supply, and it is to be hoped and I believe it will be the case that the committee will report to the House at a very early date, and I hope in that particular direction. Finally I would again urge the House to as unanimously as possible pass this motion proposed by the member for Coolgardie.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): As I am in sympathy with the motion brought forward by the member for Coolgardie, perhaps it is not necessary to say anything except that I would not like the amendment to go forth without refutation. I consider the remarks of the member for Coolgardie have been to a great extent exaggerated. That is, in regard to the terrible effects that might result to the mining industry in the event of this high tariff being imposed. I do not think that even the imposition of this taxation will have such a very terrible effect on the industry; for the reason that we have already some £3,000,000 worth of mining machinery in this State, and that it is not to be expected the importation of machinery in the future will be on such a great scale as it has been in the past. Still, at the

same time, there is a great deal in the contention that the imposition of the duty will do a certain amount of injury. That applies to the case of those of our large companies which are at the present time trying to raise funds, and also to any low-grade propositions to be placed on the market. When we consider that up to the present time over £3,000,000 worth of machinery has been introduced into the State, under a 5 per cent. duty, the total duty thus amounting to £150,000, whereas with a 25 per cent. duty the amount would have been £750,000, it is easy to conceive what damage the higher duty may do, particularly in regard to low-grade propositions to be placed on either the Australian or the London market. If such a duty as 25 per cent. be imposed on mining machinery, a very great blow will be struck at our low-grade propositions. There must be a certain amount of injury. Before the hon. member (Mr. Morgans) returned to the Chamber, I said some of his statements were exaggerated, particularly those in regard to the injury that would be done to the mining industry. I think the industry is in such a position now that it would be impossible, even by a much higher duty, to injure it to the extent which the hon. member predicts. There was, however, one very good argument adduced by the hon. member—that no benefit will accrue to the people of this State from the imposition of the high duty. I have been informed before-to-day that quotations given by Eastern manufacturers have been withdrawn, with the object of placing a higher figure on the articles. Those Eastern manufacturers mean to take every advantage of the duty; and we are likely to receive no benefit at all from it. I may also point out to members that if the motion be not carried to-night, it is extremely probable that the sliding scale will be removed. The people in this State will not, I think, put up with a high Federal Tariff and also the sliding scale. [MEMBER: They cannot.] I feel sorry that an amendment has been moved, because I desired that the motion should be carried unanimously by the House. I very much regret that any allusion has been made to Sir John Forrest, or to the federalists or anti-federalists, or to the policy of the Barton or any other Ministry. We are simply trying to protect one of

the special industries of this State—I may say the industry of this State; because if the mining industry be injured, other industries here must suffer heavily. I do hope this motion will be carried unanimously. I feel satisfied that if such is the case, some good must result.

MR. J. RESIDE (Hannans): As a goldfields representative, I may say a few words on this question. I do consider that the member for Coolgardie has been inclined to exaggerate somewhat.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Hear, hear.

MR. RESIDE: The very manner in which the motion is framed is enough to convey that idea. The hon. member says that "the people of this State view with consternation the imposition of the Federal Tariff."

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: No; he has altered that.

MR. RESIDE: I do not think the people of this State have any feeling of consternation about the Federal Tariff. The hon. member farther saw fit to deride the ability of Victoria to manufacture mining machinery. As a Victorian myself, and as one who since boyhood has been amongst mines and mining machinery, I say that as far as machinery for its own particular gold mines is concerned, Victoria can manufacture machinery equal to any imported from England. I ask, how is it that the absentee or foreign mine owner in this State is always desirous of obtaining his machinery from foreign countries? Is it simply because the directorates are established in the old country, and are consequently mixed up with industries there, and that thus it pays them better to get their machinery in the old country? I think it would be better for the mining industry if the duty on mining machinery had not been so severe. Farther, I think it would have been better if machinery had been classified. There are some classes of machinery which can well be made here, and protective duties might well have been imposed to a certain extent on this class of machinery. In regard to other classes, in which we cannot compete with other countries, the duties might have been made light. Therefore, we must consider the question not only from a Western Australian standpoint, but now that we have entered

into federation, from a federal, from an Australian, standpoint. As Australians, we have to look at this from a national standpoint; and whatever the policy of the individual States may be, I do not think the Commonwealth can ever afford to adopt a purely free-trade tariff.

MR. MORGANS: Are you in favour of taxing the people to the extent of 5s. per week on their food?

MR. RESIDE: I am not speaking to that question. I do not think the time will ever come when we can afford to adopt a pure free-trade policy. For this reason: we have declared for a "white Australia." We have declared in favour of keeping the dirty and nasty coloured alien out. Therefore, we cannot afford to let his goods in free. If we did, we might as well allow the alien himself in.

MR. HOPKINS: We do not grow tea, you know.

MR. RESIDE: In considering this question, we must also pay regard to the fact that we have a certain amount of money to raise through the custom-house. Between eight and nine millions are required from the custom-house at the present time. I would prefer not to see all this revenue raised through the customs. I think it would be better if the Federal Parliament considered the question of direct taxation, if they went in for a land tax and an income tax, and endeavoured to tax people who could afford to pay rather than the working-man who cannot afford to pay. That is the sort of taxation I would prefer. However, I do not think there can be much harm done by passing this motion; nor do I think that much good can be done by passing it. The question is one for the Federal Houses to consider; and they will consider it in their own way, whatever opinions we may express. Speaking now, however, from that parochial standpoint which most members have adopted, I say that I, as a mining representative, consider it would be better if the duty on mining machinery were not so heavy. Under the circumstances, I shall therefore support the motion.

MR. C. HARPER (Beverley): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: No; let us settle it to-night.

Motion (adjournment) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	25

Majority against ... 14

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Connor	Mr. Butcher
Mr. George	Mr. English
Mr. Harper	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Haslie
Mr. Monger	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Plesse	Mr. Higham
Mr. Stone	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Smith (Teller).	Mr. Illingworth
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. Leake
	Mr. McDonald
	Mr. McWilliams
	Mr. Morgans
	Mr. Oate
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Reside
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Wilson (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

MR. W. J. GEORGE (Murray): I had no intention of speaking on the motion this evening. The matter is too important in my opinion for a member to have to rise hurriedly and speak on it; but rather than this debate shall lapse, I will try, without the aid of matter which I had been preparing (but did not expect would be required this evening), to place some views before the House. So far as I have gone into the Federal Tariff, I hope that tariff will not pass. In my opinion, if it does pass, it will do incalculable harm to the Commonwealth, and will do a tremendous lot of injury to almost every industry, if not every industry, in this State. It may be asked: what have the manufacturers to grumble at in the tariff—they have got a protection ranging up to 25 per cent., and a possibility of bonuses far beyond the dreams or expectations or imaginations of even a Western Australian Parliament? The answer I give to that question is, that if you give a man a benefit with one hand and with the other hand you take that benefit away, surely the last state of that man is worse than the first. The manufacturers in the Commonwealth get a protection up to 25 per cent., and they enjoy with it the inestimable benefit, which I hope they will appreciate at its full value, of paying on

raw material, from which they have to provide the finished article, a duty which, taken altogether, nullifies practically the 25 per cent. of protection. The member for Coolgardie gave an instance of a 10-stamper battery complete, which he reckoned to cost about £3,000; and he stated (his estimate being very near the mark) that the labour in producing that battery, the wages and the machinery, would probably be about £1,200. That is very near the right proportion with regard to it. The material that is necessary comes probably to as much as the wages; and the balance of the money should provide for working expenses, interest on capital, and that which all manufacturers and all men in business hope to see—the profit on the labour they expend. It has been stated, and it cannot be denied, that under the new tariff the cost of living will be considerably higher than before. Putting aside altogether the Western Australian tariff, I say those arguments which were used by men here engaged in the anti-federal campaign, that the cost of living would be increased, are now confirmed. Members who have spoken from the Government side of the House to-night have admitted what they denied before, that the cost of living must necessarily be increased. If the cost of living is increased, then necessarily this must have a reflex action on the question of wages. If a man is getting 10s. a day in wages, and his cost of living is 75 or 80 per cent. of the 10s., and if suddenly the cost of living rises more than the 80 per cent., necessarily he must demand, if he is to live fairly and decently as he ought to do, a higher rate of wages. Consequently the manufacturer, with his 25 per cent. protection or bonus, is placed in this position, that in his right hand he holds the cake of 25 per cent. assistance, and his left hand is weighed down by the fact that he has to pay more for his raw material, that owing to the increased price of living he has to pay higher wages: and then, what have you got? The empty shadow of protection, which in the instance of manufacturers is not worth having in any shape whatever.

[MR. GEORGE called attention to the state of the House. Bells rung and quorum formed.]

MR. GEORGE (continuing): I am sorry indeed to inflict on members so

much eloquence; but I hope I shall convince them, especially some who have been absent, before I finish. In fact, I have convinced two hon. members already, sir, and I think we are again without a quorum.

THE SPEAKER: I think there are seventeen members here now.

MR. GEORGE: Then I must try to entertain those seventeen members with arguments that will appeal not only to their sense of justice, but also to their sense of duty, by reminding them that they are paid servants of this State, and that in order to form a just opinion on matters affecting the people of this State, they should attend in this Chamber and listen to whoever may be addressing the House.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Stonewalling!

MR. GEORGE: One Minister who is in his place made an interjection about stonewalling. Does he look like a man who has anything to do with a stone wall, or a brick wall, or any other kind of wall? Let me recommend, with all due respect to the Colonial Treasurer, that he will keep in those paths where he is practical, and when he comes to hard work he will do what he has done all his life, give it the go-by.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: He works as hard as the hon. member.

MR. GEORGE: I am working very hard at present, and am earning my £4 a week by the sweat of my tongue.

MR. JACOBY: I call attention to the state of the House. The Government should keep a quorum.

[Bells rung, and quorum formed.]

THE SPEAKER: The rule is, that on private members' nights it is the duty of private members to keep a House, and not the duty of the Government.

MR. GEORGE: I may say, in reference to the Speaker's remark, that I do not know whether it is the duty of private members to keep a quorum, but I have been trying to keep a quorum. Unfortunately, some members find other attractions, and go out of this Chamber.

THE SPEAKER: I said what the rule was, because I noticed that the Whip on the Opposition side stated it was the duty of the Government to keep a House. It is only the duty of the Government to keep a House on Government nights.

MR. GEORGE: I do not question your decision, sir. I was dealing, before I was so rudely interrupted by the absence of members who should have been in their places, with a question which had been brought up by the member for Coolgardie, in reference to the duty on raw materials, and was showing that this so-called protection to the industries of the Commonwealth is absolutely a bladder which can be pricked by anybody who chooses to do it. Increase the manufactures of this State?—certainly not! Increase and better the position of the workers of this State under this tariff?—certainly not! What will be the effect of the tariff on this State and on the workers in it? Those who find the cost of living in the State is too high for the wages which the manufacturers will have the ability to pay, will do—what? They cannot stay here if their position is in the slightest degree worse than it would be in the other States. The consequence will be that the mechanics, the artisans, and the tradesmen who have flocked to this State during the last five or six years, among them being some of the best tradesmen that Australia has produced, men who would have established themselves in this State and would have established industries by which the present population and those to come after them would be able to earn wages, and afford better opportunities than they could otherwise hope to obtain—those men will have to leave the State and take with them their belongings; and we shall simply retain in this State those who are altogether dependent upon the gold industry, while the bulk of the artisans will be driven out of it, to swell the competition and increase the wage-earners in the other States. It may be said that what affects the other States will affect this State. If the Eastern States are injuriously affected, so must the other States be. But what are the facts in connection with what is termed the iron trade? The facts are simply these: the raw material which it is necessary to manufacture the goods from, either engines, batteries, or machines of that sort, has been imported into the Eastern States at a far less cost than it can be brought into this State, and at a far less rate than it can ever be brought in again. It is said

the steamers' freight is sufficient to protect the industries of this State. That is an assertion which is made without proper thought on the part of those who make it. [Member interjected.] The hon. member might not be aware that it is impossible to prevent a person having a bad throat.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: You are not obliged to speak.

MR. GEORGE: Certainly I am. Perhaps it would be as well after that remark, and in the present temper of the House, to adjourn. I move the adjournment of the debate.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	19

Majority against ... 5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Gregory
Mr. George	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Harper	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Piessé	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Rason	Mr. Leake
Mr. Smith	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Stone	Mr. McWilliams
Mr. Yelverton	Mr. Oats
Mr. Connor (Teller).	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Reside
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wilson
	Mr. Wallace (Teller).

Motion thus negatived, and the debate continued.

MR. GEORGE rose to speak.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot speak again.

Amendment put, and negatived on the voices.

Main question put and passed.

MR. MORGANS: I move that the resolution be transmitted to the Prime Minister of the Federal Parliament by Mr. Speaker.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Before that motion is put, I would like to call the attention of the hon. member for Coolgardie to the fact that when he moved the motion he altered the wording slightly, but that alteration was not put in the motion. I think it was generally understood that the word "consternation" should give place to "much anxiety."

MR. MORGANS: I am prepared to make that alteration.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member did indicate the amendment, but he did not ask leave to amend the motion.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member did mention it before the question was put. It is not necessary to ask leave: the mere indication of the hon. member's intention to make the amendment was sufficient.

THE SPEAKER: If the House agree, then the amendment will be made.

MR. NANSON: I would like to address a few observations to the House on the motion that the resolution be transmitted to the Federal Parliament. I beg to submit that it is most undesirable at this stage to transmit a motion to the Federal Parliament that criticises the action of that body, which is a superior Parliament, because it is a Parliament that represents the whole of Australia, whereas we represent but a single State.

THE SPEAKER: The motion is that the resolution be transmitted to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth.

MR. NANSON: I submit to your correction: the principle, however is the same. If we transmit to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth a resolution of this description, there can be no question, if there be any meaning at all in the English language, that we are submitting a resolution that is condemning the Federal Government, the Federal Tariff, and the Federal Parliament. A more sweeping motion, a more condemnatory motion never issued from any Parliament House in Australia. Let us for a moment look at the motion, analyse it word by word, sentence by sentence, comma by comma, and full-stop by full-stop. What does the motion say:—

That this House views with much anxiety the Federal Tariff which has been promulgated, in view of the serious consequences that must result to the trade and commerce of this State, as well as to the mining industry, which is one of the principal elements of prosperity; and this House respectfully enters its protest against the imposition of the proposed tariff in its present form.

I quite understand that if this House were to pass a motion saying that while we did not express an opinion on the tariff as a whole, we ventured respectfully to ask that the duties in regard to mining material, mining machinery, and mining requisites should be reduced, that would

be an intelligible proposition; but for this Parliament to arrogate to itself, when it is already—

MR. MORGANS: In order to save the time of the House that will be involved in discussing this question, and as it is now very late, I am prepared to withdraw my motion as to transmitting the Message to the Federal Prime Minister.

THE SPEAKER: If there is no opposition to the motion, then it is withdrawn.

MR. NANSON: I desire to oppose the withdrawal of the motion.

THE SPEAKER: Then the motion is not withdrawn.

MR. NANSON: I will proceed, if I am in order, to state my objections to the motion. I object to its withdrawal, because what does it amount to if we adopt that course? It means that the member for Coolgardie loads a gun and then is ashamed to fire it. It means that this House passes a resolution, but is ashamed to transmit it to the Prime Minister. If we pass the motion—

MR. HOPKINS: We have passed it.

MR. NANSON: Then let us go farther.

MR. HOPKINS: Why?

MR. NANSON: I am opposed to sending it on. [Laughter.] Hon. members laugh, and I can quite understand their doing so; because they happen to be in the majority; but I am fighting in this matter for the rights of the minority, and I will continue to do so despite the laughter of hon. members, and despite any other sort of organised obstruction which may be brought to bear against me. If I may, I shall continue my interrupted argument as to the effect outside Western Australia of this motion. As I said, there can be no possible objection to a motion which, without expressing a general opinion on the tariff, urges the Federal Government to reduce the duties in certain particulars. Let hon. members ask themselves again what construction will be put on the motion which we are now, or were just now, asked to transmit to the Federal Prime Minister. Let them ask themselves, not what construction will be put on it in Western Australia, but what construction will be put on it in the wider area of the Commonwealth. We want to get—I take it the hon. member for Coolgardie is at one with me

in this—the very best possible terms we can for Western Australia under the Federal Tariff. Now, does it commend itself to the wisdom of hon. members, as men of ordinary common sense, that if we transmit a resolution of this description, practically condemning the Federal Government, we are likely to get any special consideration from the Barton Ministry? The Barton Ministry know that the members we have sent to the Federal Parliament, with one exception, are free-traders. The Ministry know that they cannot be worse off so far as Western Australia is concerned. Therefore I say, if we put this crowning slight, injury, insult and indignity on Sir John Forrest, who represents Western Australia in the Federal Ministry, we shall make a bitter enemy of the Ministry. I say we should not bring the party politics of the Federal Government on the floor of this House; and although I acquit the member for Coolgardie of any suspicion of enmity to Sir John Forrest—I know the hon. member's motives to be absolutely and sincerely honest—I say we must look at the resolution not from the point of view as to how it will be regarded in Perth and Western Australia, but as to how it will be interpreted in the Federal Parliament if transmitted, by that arch-priest of political manoeuvre, Mr. Reid. Does any hon. member mean to tell me that Mr. Reid, if this resolution goes forward to the Prime Minister, will not make party capital out of it?

MR. HOPKINS: Certainly; so he should.

MR. NANSON: Will not Mr. Reid from the floor of the Federal House of Representatives jeer at Sir John Forrest and say, "See what has happened in your own Parliament! See how the mighty are fallen! See how the Parliament which at one time you led by the nose has turned against you! You can find only one or two, or perhaps three members to defend you." I protest again, therefore, and I will continue to protest while I have breath in my body, against the slight, the injury, the indignity, and the insult proposed to be done to the leading Western Australian of us all. I find it difficult to restrain my feelings of indignation. I find it difficult to speak on a subject like this in the language of calmness and prudence. If my feelings

carry me away, I beg the House will pardon me. I beg the House to remember the allegiance we still owe, as West Australians, to the greatest Western Australian of us all, who is upholding the interests of Western Australia, who is doing more for Western Australia in the Federal Parliament, I believe, than all the rest of our members put together. [Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Sir John Forrest is a noble man; he is a man of world-wide reputation; he is the man under whose administration Western Australia has progressed more within the last 10 years than she progressed during all the rest of her existence.

MR. DAGLISH: You mean, suffered more.

MR. NANSON: "Suffered more," the member for Subiaco remarks. I am ashamed of him. I am ashamed of the unworthy reflection he has attempted to cast on a gentleman who, if he were on the floor of this House, would have known how to reply to a retort of that description. If the amendment which I have moved to the motion for the transmission of the resolution to the Prime Minister fail to meet the sense of the House, I shall be perfectly willing to withdraw it, provided some hon. member will substitute for it another amendment which, while not condemning the Federal Tariff as a whole, will place in a reasonable light the special needs of this State. I do intend, even if the tactics of obstruction be necessary, to oppose, and to continue to oppose, any sort of motion which, if passed by this House, may be used as an engine of destruction against the best friend of this State, Sir John Forrest.

MR. HOPKINS: You said that before.

MR. NANSON: I have said it before, and I say it again; and I will continue to say it. I do not know whether I am in order in moving the adjournment of this debate. If any motion at all is before the House, I will again move that the debate be adjourned, so that hon. members may have an opportunity of going home to think over the matter, and turn it over in their minds, in order to see whether it is not possible—perhaps even the member for Coolgardie may see that it is possible—to substitute, I will not say a less offensive motion, but a motion on which it will be possible to put a less offensive construction.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member would not be in order in moving the adjournment of the debate. A motion for adjournment must be made without debate.

MR. HASTIE: Is there any debate, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NANSON: When speaking earlier in the evening I said it was not my intention to enter into the vast, inexhaustible, and profound subject of protection and free-trade. I had come here armed with a number of statistics and particulars, and a quantity of interesting facts.

POINTS OF ORDER.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: I rise to a point of order. The subject matter before the House is the question whether we shall or shall not transmit a certain resolution passed by the House to the Federal Prime Minister, Mr. Barton. Is the hon. member in order in introducing the question of protection or free-trade?

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is in order. He must confine himself to the question of whether the resolution should be forwarded to the Prime Minister or not.

MR. HASTIE: Has not the motion for the transmission of the resolution been withdrawn?

THE SPEAKER: If there is one negative to the withdrawal of a motion, it cannot be withdrawn. The member for the Murchison objected to the withdrawal, and the motion is therefore before the House.

MR. HOPKINS: Was the member for Coolgardie in order in moving the transmission of the resolution without giving notice of motion?

THE SPEAKER: I think he was.

MR. HOPKINS: That being so, is the motion before the House?

THE SPEAKER: The motion is before the House now.

MR. MORGANS: If the feeling of hon. members is that the motion for the transmission of the resolution should not be withdrawn, I am quite ready to fall in with their views. Personally, I am very desirous that the resolution should be transmitted to the Prime Minister, in order that he may know what the feeling of the House is in regard to this question.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member must not interrupt the member for the Murchison in his speech.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. NANSON: While bowing with all respect to your ruling, sir, I may explain how it is that the question of whether this resolution should or should not be transmitted to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, is intimately bound up, bound up in such a way that we cannot separate the two subjects, with the vast and important question of protection or free-trade.

THE SPEAKER: I do not see how the question of free-trade or protection can have anything to do with the motion that the resolution passed by this House shall be transmitted to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth.

MR. NANSON: A good deal hinges on the construction which will be placed on our action, if the House decide to pass the motion in favour of transmitting the resolution in question to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, Mr. Barton. In this way: if we decide to transmit this motion to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, we affirm the principle of a free-trade tariff, and—

MR. HOPKINS: No.

MR. NANSON: And denounce the principle of a protective tariff.

MR. HOPKINS: No, no.

MR. NANSON: There can be no question as to the plain meaning of the resolution. I do not want to weary hon. members by reading it over again.

MR. HOPKINS: The resolution is not the question before the House.

MR. NANSON: If hon. members will study the resolution closely, they will see that in transmitting it to the Federal Prime Minister we are transmitting a resolution which deals with the very vital question of the tariff, whether it shall be a free-trade tariff or a protective tariff.

MR. HOPKINS: No; not at all!

MR. NANSON: I submit that I am justified in using the forms of the House in order to impress on hon. members, before it be too late, what may be the consequence of their action. Hon. members say they approve of the resolution; and, no doubt, we all may approve of it; but what I want to drive into the minds of hon. members, or coax into their minds,

if possible, is the construction which will be placed on the resolution if transmitted as proposed, not in Western Australia—that does not matter—but in Melbourne, in the Federal Parliament; and therefore I submit I am perfectly in order in going into the question of protection or free-trade, which question, I think, is indissolubly bound up with the resolution. If the resolution be transmitted to the Federal Prime Minister, it will be regarded as an expression of opinion on the fiscal question; whereas if I succeed in carrying my point, that this motion shall not be transmitted to the Federal Prime Minister, we admit at once that although the House was prepared to carry the resolution, it was not prepared to proceed with the logical consequence of its action—that the House carried a certain resolution, but was not prepared to transmit it to the Federal Prime Minister.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: We are prepared.

MR. NANSON: Some members say they are prepared to transmit it.

MR. HOPKINS: Divide and see!

MR. NANSON: My task is not to divide the House on the question, but to attempt to convince hon. members.

MR. HOPKINS: No.

MR. NANSON: Although the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) may be of a somewhat stubborn nature, he is not altogether insensible to the arts of argument, he is not altogether insensible to the arts of persuasion.

MR. HOPKINS: You have not given us any arguments yet.

MR. NANSON: If the hon. member sees that by transmitting the resolution to the Federal Prime Minister, he will be doing a serious wrong to his country, and possibly a serious wrong to the constituency he represents, he will, I believe, even at the eleventh hour recant his opinions. It is my duty to attempt to persuade, or wrestle with him until the last moment, and not to allow him to do harm unwittingly. We have had a terrible example in the past of people voting without giving sufficient consideration to the subject. This matter has to-night been laboured again and again.

MR. HOPKINS: Quite right!

MR. NANSON: It has been shown that a number of people voted for

federation without knowing exactly what they were going to do.

MR. HOPKINS: Speak for yourself!

MR. NANSON: I am speaking on the necessity of persuading the member for Boulder. I am endeavouring to prevent that hon. member from voting on the subject with a mind still unprepared—

MR. HOPKINS: With an "open mind"?

MR. NANSON: I trust the member for Boulder has an open mind. I trust an open mind is not a monopoly of this side of the House. I trust the hon. member may yet be open to persuasion. It is said that there is always time for contrition, that the sinner's hope is never at an end.

MR. HOPKINS: We have had your repentance.

MR. NANSON: Now I can see the light of repentance penetrating the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins). I perceive that my words are not altogether without effect, but the Colonial Treasurer does not seem altogether convinced yet that this is a matter that should be debated.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: I am convinced it should not be debated, it should be passed.

MR. NANSON: I can never admit that a motion that may do serious injury to this country—

POINT OF ORDER.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether, when the House is convinced that an hon. member is deliberately obstructing the business of this House, there is anything we can do to save ourselves from such a nuisance.

THE SPEAKER: I am afraid there is not. (General laughter).

MR. NANSON: I regret that I did not catch the observations of the hon. member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie), and therefore I cannot deal with them.

MR. GEORGE: He is apologising; it is all right.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. NANSON: An hon. member asks me how many hours I will take. I will remind him that this is a vastly important subject, and I do not think I could possibly take too many hours in debating a mistake so serious as

this. I may assure the hon. member that I am perfectly fresh, and that I am, in what I believe is a parliamentary term, going strong. I am only just at the beginning of my observations, as a matter of fact. If I am wearying the hon. member, I believe he is within his rights in leaving the House, and if a quorum cannot be formed I shall be brought up with a short turn. But in a matter so stupendous, so interesting, as the member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) reminds me, I do not think this discussion will be regarded as an infliction. I can see by the gravity that has overcome the faces of hon. members, that I am at last beginning to persuade them that, harmless as this motion may seem, there may lurk in it a danger which at the present moment some hon. members do not recognise. I may assure those hon. members that this motion is a very serious danger. I can assure the hon. member that, although we have only a limited population here, and although our House does not, on account of that small population, demand quite the same amount of attention as the Parliaments of the other States may do, this motion and the motion preceding it have been watched with a great amount of interest by the whole of Australia. I will explain to the hon. gentleman how I arrive at that conclusion. Just as that detective, Sherlock Holmes, was able to detect certain phenomena from certain signs he saw around him, so am I able to detect that a motion of this description is being watched with the utmost attention and the utmost expectation by the whole of the other States in Australia, because it establishes a precedent. This is a fact which must appeal to those members who do not care lightly to establish a precedent. This is the first time since the Commonwealth has been established that any State Parliament has arrogated to itself the right to censure the Federal Prime Minister, either by imputation or in any other way; and if we pass this motion, do members think the Victorian Parliament will be prepared to allow a slight of this description to be put upon its members in the Federal Government? Do you not think that if we pass a motion of this description we will find the Victorian Parliament, the South Australian Parliament, the Queensland Parliament, the Tasmanian Parliament, and

very possibly the New South Wales Parliament all joining together to debate among themselves, and passing motions the majority of which will be in favour of and not against protection? We only expose the weakness of our own case when this puny State—puny, that is, in the number of its population—throws out the gauntlet to four millions of people on the eastern side of Australia. I have not had much time to think of this matter and to prepare my language, and I have to arrange my language as I go along. A new light breaks upon me. As I said before, this motion may have utterly unexpected, utterly unforeseen consequences. You will find that in every State of Australia this matter will be brought up and debated, and you will find Western Australia sending its one resolution for, and every other State a resolution against it. Where shall we have done anything to assist the mining industry? Where shall we have done anything to put our industries on a better footing? Where shall we have done anything except to show to the whole of Australia that after all we are an insignificant portion of the people? And they will say, "The people in the West live so far away from the centres of population in the East that they have lost their sense of the due proportion of things, and they forget that they are only 180,000 people and we are four millions." I sympathise with the hon. member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) and the wish of this House to have the tariff amended—and I defy any member to show that in my remarks on the previous stage of this evening's debate I said anything against amending the tariff as it at present stands. But what I did say was that we should not pass such a motion; and now I go farther and say that, having passed that motion, we should not forward it to the Prime Minister.

THE PREMIER: That is what Mr. Morgans says.

MR. NANSON: I understood the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) had changed his mind.

MR. MORGANS: I have not changed my mind.

MR. NANSON: I see I am labouring under a misconception. I was under the conception that the member for Cool-

gardie wished to change his resolution on the Federal Prime Minister, and now I find I am mistaken.

THE PREMIER: He is willing to withdraw it.

MR. NANSON: He is willing to withdraw it.

THE PREMIER: I will take care that it goes.

MR. NANSON: Then I take it the hon. gentleman (the Premier) is willing to flout this House; and if he did, I think the hon. gentleman would commit a grossly unconstitutional act.

THE PREMIER: I shall send this to the Prime Minister.

MR. NANSON: The hon. gentleman may send it; but it will go, not as from the Premier of the State, but as from a private individual.

THE PREMIER: It will go from me, as Premier.

MR. NANSON: The hon. gentleman need not trouble himself about sending it, because I suppose it will go on the wings of the telegraph.

THE PREMIER: It will go from me, as Premier.

MR. NANSON: It may go from the hon. gentleman as Premier, and it may also go forward that the hon. the Premier was unable to get a resolution declaring that it should be forwarded.

THE PREMIER: Not at all: this (paper in hand) is my resolution.

MR. NANSON: There are limits even to the power of the hon. gentleman. I know he is an autocrat by disposition and a democrat by profession, but he must learn that there are limits to his power.

THE PREMIER: Why not define those limits?

MR. NANSON: I wish the Premier would not interrupt me, because it takes me off the track, and it only prolongs the proceedings. I have a great deal to say. (Laughter.) If he will go on interrupting me, it simply means that I get off my argument and it takes a little time before I get on again.

POINT OF ORDER.

THE PREMIER: I rise to a point of order. Is not the hon. member obstructing the business of the House?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No.

THE PREMIER: I was addressing the Chair, and not hon. members.

THE SPEAKER: I think a great deal of what the hon. member is saying is totally irrelevant to the motion before the House. I called the hon. member's attention to that before.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. NANSON: I very much regret that I have wandered from the subject. I submit that while this pernicious habit exists in this House of interrupting an hon. member when he is speaking—

THE PREMIER: Obstruction!

MR. NANSON: It is a very difficult matter to get one's thoughts in the direction they should run. I hope hon. members will not interrupt me any farther. I am not anxious to obstruct the House in any way. I want to have this question argued out in a sober, rational, and cool manner, and if the Premier will only leave me alone I think we will manage to get on without very much difficulty, and without keeping the House till a very late hour. The member for Coolgardie does not wish the motion to be submitted to the Prime Minister. Surely a somewhat strange proceeding, is it not? He passes a motion. I want to be cautious here, because I do not wish to impute any motives to the hon. member. I have a great respect for him, and I do not want to impute any motives, but it does strike me as very peculiar indeed that he should get a motion passed by this House in favour of amending the tariff, and then, when it comes to the usual course, what seems a perfectly ordinary course to hon. members who supported the motion—although I objected to it very strongly—when it comes to the usual course, he objects to do it. As I said earlier in the debate, he loads his gun but does not wish to fire it off. The hon. gentleman interjects, with that bad habit of his which I hope he is beginning to lose, and he tells us, "No; I will go behind this House. If the hon. member does not wish to send this motion, I, the great I, will see this motion is sent on." It is my duty to remind the House and the Premier, that in this matter we must take the opinion of the hon. member for Coolgardie. As I have already said, the Premier is an autocrat in disposition and a democrat in profession.

THE PREMIER: I have his approval.

MR. NANSON: We cannot allow the hon. gentleman to abuse the forms of the House in this highly irregular, this highly unseemly manner, and make a way of doing these things. Really, I would be the last to accuse the member for Coolgardie of making fun of this House, of making a fool of it, of not taking it seriously; but surely it is a remarkable proceeding that, after getting us to pass this motion in favour of altering the tariff, he actually gets up and tells us he does not wish it to be sent to the Prime Minister. There must be some hidden meaning. What deep design is there? Is there some plot between the hon. gentleman—the sole occupant of the Treasury benches at present (the Premier)—and the member for Coolgardie; some sort of telepathic correspondence between them?

THE PREMIER (leaving the House): There is none, now.

MR. NANSON: I see the hon. gentleman leaving the precincts of this Chamber, and no doubt I will see the member for Coolgardie going out on this side, and then doubtless we will understand why, having brought forward a motion and having got it passed in this House, he is unwilling to send it on to the Federal Premier. But a light breaks upon me. I can understand it now. At the last moment conviction begins to dawn upon the mind of the member for Coolgardie, and my words have not been altogether in vain: the seed has not fallen altogether upon barren ground. That is the idea germinating now. He begins to see that though his intentions may have been of the best, he may be unwittingly inflicting harm, serious damage, upon this great mining industry, the interests of which he has so much at heart. He begins to see that unwittingly he may be inflicting an injury upon the prosperity of this State, and he takes this strange course, as at first sight it may seem; but which, at any rate, if it does no credit to his head, at least does credit to his heart. He takes this course of availing himself of the last chance that is given him of withdrawing a motion that may do unspeakable injury to Western Australia. I hope I am not misconstruing the motives of the member for Coolgardie; but I put it as a serious proposition to the House: are we justi-

fied in passing a resolution of this sort, and then immediately deciding to run away from it? It reminds me somewhat of a cartoon I remember seeing in *Punch* many years ago, of a very noted statesman, who was shown as having pulled the knocker of a door, and then as running away as hard as he could, in case the door should be opened and he should be caught in the act. It seems to me the member for Coolgardie has pulled the knocker; and feeling afraid that he may be caught in the act, he decides to withdraw his motion in favour of transmitting the resolution to the Federal Premier. Feeling, at the last moment, that he has perhaps done a somewhat foolish action, although with the best intentions, in bringing forward the original motion, he takes that last resort, a sensible resort, perhaps, in the circumstances; but the only resort by which he can get out of a very serious dilemma. There is one more point to which I should like to direct attention. As I have already said, there can be no question whatever, that if we pass this motion in favour of transmitting the resolution to the Federal Prime Minister, it will be regarded as a definite and final expression of opinion from this House. If our Premier send it along personally, we can afford to disregard it; because it is well known that although the Premier conducts the business of the country, he does it only so long as he is allowed to do so, he does it only because the members of the Opposition are willing to allow him to do it; and therefore his sending the resolution would not be regarded as an official act. But if this House pass the motion, then the sending of the original resolution to the Federal Prime Minister will be regarded as an official act; and it opens up a very grave constitutional question, whether if we finally commit ourselves, whether if we take this irrevocable step, we are not interfering with the rights of the Commonwealth Parliament; whether the people of Western Australia are not attempting to usurp the general rights of the sovereign people of Australia as a whole. You see, the more one looks into the matter, the more one looks into the principle at stake, the more illimitable seems to be the field which opens out before us. If we do this subject justice,

if we recognise its great constitutional importance, I can see no possible chance of bringing this debate to an end within anything like a reasonable time.

MR. JACOBY: I beg to draw attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present.

MR. HOPKINS: After you sent the members out.

[Bells rung, and quorum formed.]

THE SPEAKER: Before the hon. member (Mr. Nanson) continues, I should like to read to him the rule in *May* with reference to this matter which is now proceeding:—

Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or of the Committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevant or tedious repetition, either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech.

I think the hon. member has been trying the patience of the House very considerably by constant repetition and irrelevant observations. I now call the attention of the House to the fact; and if he continue to do so, I shall act on this order, and insist on his discontinuing his speech.

MR. NANSON: In the circumstances, sir, as I speak under very great disadvantages, and as the forms of the House have been used in order to burk discussion—

POINT OF ORDER.

THE PREMIER: I rise to a point of order. Before the hon. member can say that, he should submit something in justification.

THE SPEAKER: I think he should.

THE PREMIER: It is practically a charge against the Chair.

THE SPEAKER: I cannot see that the forms of the House have been made use of to burk discussion.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. NANSON: Well, sir, I shall withdraw that observation, and apologise for it if necessary, and shall merely state that there has been a very evident desire on the part of several hon. members to speak on the question, which they regard as of very great and very momentous importance; and that although they happen on this point to be in a minority, yet I think the ordinary courtesy of the House should have been extended to those members. Nothing is more

repugnant to me than to seem to do anything that may lead to the obstruction of the business of this House; but if my conduct bears that construction, I would point out that sometimes the end justifies the means. I know that several hon. members wished to continue this debate at a later stage; they had not their material ready, and the brute force of the majority was used to prevent their speaking later on; and although that may not be burking discussion, although I unreservedly withdraw that phrase, I still find myself unable to find another phrase that adequately represents what was done. But as I respect, and I hope I always shall respect, the ruling of the Chair, and as you have intimated to me that I may have been irrelevant in speaking as I have done, under very great difficulties—possibly I have been irrelevant—I will now resume my seat; only saying, in conclusion, that any action I may have taken has been taken with the idea of entering a most solemn and emphatic protest against an attempt that has been made to prevent hon. members of this House, whose words are usually listened to with the greatest attention, and who wished to have the debate adjourned so that they might speak on a future occasion—I will only say that my protest has been made in order to give them an opportunity of doing what I contend every member of the House has a right to do.

HON. F. H. PIESSE (Williams): In the circumstances, I feel that I cannot support the motion. I may say I consider that a motion such as this which has been put forward by the member for Coolgardie, should have received at the hands of this House much more discussion; and I can assure the House it was the intention of several members to farther discuss the question before the House in regard to this resolution: it was with that object that the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) rose for the purpose of adjourning the debate; and in fact it was decided that we should not attempt to carry it farther if the hon. member (Mr. Morgans) did not express his acquiescence in the adjournment this evening. And I understood the adjournment was to be moved for the purpose of considering a farther amendment which would have been proposed by the member

for Beverley, with which, in the main, I understood the member for Coolgardie was in accord. It was for that reason the opposition was shown to the adjournment; and therefore I say I did not wish to obstruct, or in any way to prevent this motion being put to the House; but I wished to enter my protest against a matter of such importance being disposed of before it had been fully considered. I may say I was in sympathy with the member for Coolgardie in regard to his motion, and it was my intention to speak to it later; and I may say I had prepared notes which I was unable to make use of to-night, owing to the many matters which that hon. member had raised; and I intended on a later date to continue the subject, and to bring before the House some points which I consider would have assisted the hon. member, yet at the same time with a view of farther modifying the resolution. That is why it was intended that the motion should be postponed to-night. Not with the intention of causing the Government any inconvenience or of causing any inconvenience to the House, but with the desire of obtaining farther information on the subject and assisting the member for Coolgardie in connection with the motion which he had tabled. In these circumstances the adjournment that was asked for might readily have been conceded. I have said before that when I can assist in having the rules and procedure of the House respected I am only too anxious to do so, and in this case it was only with that desire that the opposition was shown to the adjournment and a division called for. If it had not been for the terms made by the member for Coolgardie, a division would not have been called for on the matter disposed of; but being an important question, conveying the opinions of the House, I did not like it to go forward that I had agreed to the motion without expressing an opinion. That is the reason I opposed the sending forward of the resolution, and I do oppose it, and my opposition was on those grounds. Several members desired to speak, and an opportunity should have been given to those members. It has been the practice always, where farther discussion is desired, that an adjournment be granted; it is to the advantage not only of the proposer of

the motion, but to the House, to give full liberty to discuss any matter which is of importance. I admit that the Premier no doubt is thirsting for vengeance and trying no doubt to ridicule in a humorous and sarcastic way that which has taken place, and to deal in that manner with the matter which we should like to consider seriously. This is a serious matter: a motion is passed by the House without a division, and conveyed to the Ministry of the Federal Parliament, and the resolution appears to have been passed unanimously. The motion was not carried on the voices, for owing to a disturbance which occurred when it was being put, no notice was taken of what was being done, or there would have been farther discussion and the question would not have reached the stage it has reached now, a motion having been tabled to convey the resolution to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth. I oppose the motion going forward, and object to the way the resolution was passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake): It is with feelings almost of pain that I approach the farther consideration of the subject which I thought perhaps we had heard the last of this evening. Some members may think I would feel pleasure in seeing the members opposite quarrelling amongst themselves, but really it pains me. I find the member for the Murchison, the member for Coolgardie, the leader of the Opposition, and the member for Beverley all squabbling amongst themselves; and here am I posing, for the first time during the session, as a peacemaker. I rise to pour oil on the troubled waters. Do not say it is boiling oil, because it is not. I am really very sorry to think that these members have misled themselves, and that too without the assistance of the Government. The leader of the Opposition complains that no opportunity was afforded him to discuss the question. Is it possible to conceive a gentleman with his parliamentary experience, backed up by a man pre-eminently qualified in that regard, namely the Chairman of Committees (the member for Beverley), does not know sufficient of the rules of the House to step in and have a debate on the subject when there is not only an original motion but an amendment before the House? I can quite understand the mem-

ber for the Murchison being misled, because he is a new member; and I know the member for Coolgardie is not very much concerned, because he has succeeded in carrying his motion, and what little assistance I have been able to give the member for Coolgardie I have given most readily. I do hope members on that (Opposition) side of the House will cease these squabbles amongst themselves. Really I do not like them: they are to be deprecated. If the members opposite want to squabble, let them squabble with us.

OPPOSITION MEMBER: Do not worry.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member says "do not worry." I cannot help worrying when I find the members of a happy family suddenly involved in disagreements of this painful character. I suggest now that the member for Coolgardie should withdraw the motion which seems to have flouted members on the other side and caused a certain amount of trouble. If the members have been playing with firearms and did not know they were loaded, members must not blame us. That seems to be the position of members opposite. I will support the member for Coolgardie. I urge him in all sincerity to withdraw the motion which seems to give so much trouble. Of course he cannot do that except with the consent of his friends on the other side of the House. When he was anxious to have the matter terminated he was desirous of withdrawing, and it places him in a rather painful position when his friends and colleagues object to the withdrawal. It does not matter to this side what the result is. The member for the Murchison does not want the motion carried, and curiously enough the member for Coolgardie, his friend, says he does not desire to press it: are they not at one on the subject? Why really squabble about a matter of this sort. I give members this assurance: I will telegraph this motion to-morrow morning to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, and if necessary to the leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, saying that Parliament has carried the motion of the member for Coolgardie without a division. What can the House desire more than that? That is a plain statement of fact, and I think that it would be a pity it should go forth to the

members of the Federal Ministry or to the Federal Parliament that the members of the Opposition have squabbled about so small a matter as to the method of transmission of this very important message which Parliament has carried, I say unanimously, but which everybody will admit has been carried without a division. Will hon. members accept this assurance from me? Will they urge on the member for Coolgardie that he should withdraw? Then we shall once and for all be that happy family which we were, or thought we were, some few days ago.

MR. MORGANS (in reply): I desire to say, in reference to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Hon. F. H. Piesse), that he has not placed the facts before the House quite as I understand them. What occurred was this. The motion for the adjournment of the debate was opposed, and we had a division on it. The member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby) approached me afterwards and asked me, with regard to a second division, whether in view of the fact that the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) wished to speak, I would consent to the adjournment of the debate. Personally, I shall be only too glad to assent to that. I should have been very pleased to have this matter discussed as fully as possible. However, after investigating the position, I went over to the other side of the House with the intention of speaking to the Premier, and asking him whether, in the event of the debate being adjourned, he would consent to the motion being placed in a prominent position on the Notice Paper, so that it might be settled to-morrow. Whilst this approach on my part to the Premier was on the *tapis*, the member for the Murray proposed the adjournment of the House, and before I had come to any decision—

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Adjournment of the debate.

THE PREMIER: You did not ask me.

MR. MORGANS: No. I say I was discussing the matter with the Premier, when the member for the Murray moved the adjournment of the House.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Of the debate.

MR. MORGANS: Yes; of the debate. So before I had an opportunity of exercising what I hope I may consider my charms of persuasion on the Premier—and I may say that when I approached

him on the question he seemed a little bit ruffled, and appeared as though he did not intend to receive my request for—

THE PREMIER: Pardon me. I say you did not question me. This is all news to me: this is what causes me pain.

MR. MORGANS: I do not wish to convey for a moment that I did put the matter to my friend the Premier. I was only feeling my way for the purpose of doing so. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman saw quite well what I intended.

THE PREMIER: Oh, no!

MR. MORGANS: I was really going to discuss the question with him, to see whether it was possible for us to arrange for the adjournment of the debate and get the matter placed in a forward position for to-morrow. Just at that moment my friend the member for the Murray proposed the adjournment of the debate.

MR. GEORGE: And got "sat on."

MR. MORGANS: I left the House: I did not vote for or against the motion for adjournment, because my intention was to pour oil on troubled waters and try to arrange matters in a way satisfactory to both sides. I strongly object to the remark of my friend the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) as to an attempt on the part of anybody in this House to burk debate.

MR. NANSON: I did not say you attempted to burk debate.

MR. MORGANS: I am glad to know that I am acquitted; but I think it wrong that an accusation should be made against any member of intending to burk debate on any question. This being a most important question, my desire was to get it settled, and the result brought before the Federal Parliament at the earliest possible moment. The ordinary result of an adjournment in a matter of this kind is to put off the final decision probably for a month or five weeks. It is only necessary to look at the Notice Paper before the House at the present time, to see that notices of motion brought forward weeks ago are still on the paper without any decision having been arrived at. With regard to this debate, it was a matter of importance to get the result of the division before the Federal Parliament as soon as possible, in order that some consideration

might be given to the wishes of Western Australia on this great question of the tariff, on which our life's blood, our very existence, depends more or less. It is quite a fair thing that this House should have some opportunity of expressing an opinion on the very important question of the tariff. Our only desire is to let the Federal Parliament know, to let Mr. Barton and his Ministers know, that Western Australia is placed in a position of danger through the tariff now proposed. The very existence of the State is placed in danger by the promulgation of that tariff. I have tried to show to the House to-night that if the tariff be brought into existence, if it be accepted and passed by the Federal Parliament, the chief and only industry of this country which is bringing to it—

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. MORGANS: If not the only industry, at any rate it is the principal industry, which is bringing revenue, prosperity, and success to the State—this great enterprise is going to suffer severely by the enactment of the proposed tariff. That is the object of the House. Now, my friend the member for the Murchison says, what? That we have raised in the resolution the question of protection or free-trade. I deny it. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] There is nothing in the resolution which conveys anything in the nature of a pronouncement on the question of protection or free-trade.

MR. NANSON: That is the construction which will be placed on it.

MR. MORGANS: I do not agree with my friend at all. I do not see how such a construction can be placed on the resolution.

MR. NANSON: That is the construction the Federal Parliament will put on it.

MR. MORGANS: Oh, no; I do not think so.

MR. NANSON: Decidedly.

MR. MORGANS: There is no reason for thinking so. The resolution simply says:

That this House views with much anxiety the Federal Tariff which has been promulgated, in view of the serious consequences that must result to the trade and commerce of this State, as well as to the mining industry, which is one of the principal elements of prosperity; and this House respectfully enters its protest against the imposition of the proposed tariff in its present form.

I maintain that the resolution conveys no vote of censure on the Federal Government or Parliament in any way. It is simply drawing a red-herring across the trail of this discussion for my friend the member for the Murchison to say that there is any intention to pass a vote of censure on the Federal Parliament or Government in any way by that resolution. I will go farther and say that when the resolution is received by the Federal Government, and considered by them, and when it is brought before the Federal Parliament, it will simply be regarded as a protest from Western Australia against the imposition of the Federal Tariff, on the ground that the tariff will seriously injure the great mining industry of this State. That is the only view which will be taken of the resolution. If I thought for one moment that the resolution conveyed in any sense whatever a reflection on the Federal Parliament or the Federal Government, I would be the last man in the House to attempt to carry it. As I said before, I look on the Federal Parliament as supreme in Australia; and I do not for one moment wish to convey any censure on the Federal Government or the Federal Parliament. We know perfectly well, so far as regards the member for the Murchison, that the stone-walling and burking which he did so cleverly to-night—I must compliment him on his tactics—are due to the fact that he is a saturated and crusted protectionist, and is absolutely in terror lest any resolution going from this House to the Federal Parliament might be likely in any measure to reduce the taxes which are placed on the people of this State. I am sure my friend will agree with me when I say that whatever his principles may be with regard to protection or free-trade, whether he be a free-trader or a protectionist, his first desire, his first object must be the good of Western Australia, and not the principles of either free-trade or protection. I am sure he will agree with me in this. Now, as regards the transmission of the resolution, I desire to say to my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, that, so far as I am concerned, I shall be only too glad to have farther discussion on the question. I have no desire to stop discussion; and I told the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) that I was most anxious to hear his views on the ques-

tion from the agricultural standpoint, and I also desire to hear the views of the leader of the Opposition from the agricultural point of view. Therefore, I can assure those hon. gentlemen that I had no desire whatever to burk discussion in this matter.

MR. GEORGE: We acquit you of that.

MR. HOPKINS: It is the other fellow.

MR. MORGANS: Those hon. members say they do not accuse me of wishing to burk discussion on this subject. Then I have nothing more to say on that. But I would like to say this: I have seen no tendency on the part of the Premier to do so either. I do not think the steps they have taken have tended to show that was their desire. The desire has been to look upon the motion as one of great importance to this State. That has been the point, and the desire of the House has been that this motion should be carried or rejected, and that, if carried, it should be brought under the notice of the Federal Government at the earliest possible moment. If this motion, having been carried in this House, be not sent to the Federal Parliament at an early date, we might just as well not have discussed the question. It would be altogether too late, and the only object I have had in view has not been, as my friend has said in this House, to in any way cast a vote of censure on the Federal Government, but simply to lead them in the direction of doing justice to Western Australia. That is all. We wish to elevate their views with regard to this tariff, which is going to inflict the greatest injury upon the greatest industry of this State; and I say as far as our position in this House is concerned, if we believe that an injustice is to be done to the State by the imposition of the Federal Tariff, if we believe that a great and practically the only industry of this State is going to receive a death-blow by the imposition of the Federal duties, it is the duty of the House, and of every member of the House, to carry this motion, and to do everything they can to bring the importance of this question before the Federal Government without any intention whatever of casting a vote of censure upon them, but at the same time to let the Federal Parliament know that if the imposition of these duties is going to ruin the only industry, or at least the main industry, of this

State, they should hesitate, they should pause, before they deal a death-blow to the mining industry of Western Australia. (Applause.)

MR. C. HARPER (in explanation): As my name has been mentioned—

POINT OF ORDER.

MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We had your decision, not long since during this session, that when a member has moved a motion, and other members have discussed it, and the mover of the motion has subsequently replied, it is not competent for any member to address the House.

MEMBERS: There is an amendment.

MR. HOPKINS: A proposition was moved, I understand, by the member for Coolgardie; it was laid before the House, and was replied to by the member for Coolgardie.

MR. GEORGE: This is another matter.

MR. F. CONNOR: There was an amendment by the member for the Murchison.

THE SPEAKER: There is no amendment before the House. There was a subsequent motion made by the member for Coolgardie.

MR. HARPER: The member for the Boulder is rather hasty. I rose to say I wished to make a personal explanation.

MR. HOPKINS: Under those circumstances, probably I should apologise for having risen; but if the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) had taken the precaution to preface his remarks with those words, I should have known what to do. He is an old enough Parliamentarian to know better.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. HARPER: The hon. member is usually a little hasty. I was using those words when he interrupted me. I wish to make a personal explanation in regard to this. I desired to move an amendment on the question before the House, and I mentioned this to the mover of the motion, who agreed to it. He said he would be quite agreeable to my moving the adjournment, and I rose and moved the adjournment accordingly. I had not prepared the amendment, and therefore I rose to move the adjournment of the House. And it appeared to me, from the action the Premier and his supporters

took, that they found the question inconvenient and did not wish to discuss it.

MR. HOPKINS: Question!

MR. W. J. GEORGE: I wish to make a personal explanation. It was simply knowing the facts stated by the member for Beverley that caused me to occupy the time of the House, according to our Standing Orders. That is why I made the speech I did this evening.

MR. MONGER (York): Am I in order in moving a farther amendment?

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. MONGER: I am asking the Speaker; I am not asking the Premier.

THE SPEAKER: I think the hon. member can make an amendment.

MR. MONGER: I beg to move, as an amendment:

That the transmission of the motion to the Federal Prime Minister be postponed, pending farther consideration.

We have had a very lengthy discussion on what appears a very pressing motion as regards Western Australia. We have heard it debated in most eloquent terms by the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) and the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson). We have heard numerous arguments brought forward from both sides. We have heard the learned explanation given by the Premier. We have had more figures introduced into this question than have been introduced into any Budget Speech during the last 11 years—that is since the advent of responsible government—and I say with all respect that it was absolutely unfair on the part of the Premier not to agree to the adjournment of the debate in order that hon. members might have some slight chance of grasping those big and lengthy figures, which were so ably introduced by the member for Coolgardie. No doubt they are all the outcome of Government returns, etc., but a member hearing a lengthy and able address like that given by the member for Coolgardie can have no possible chance of replying unless at least some few hours' opportunity be given for the purpose. I know well that the member for Coolgardie had studied this question before he attempted to give to this House the figures which he gave us. And how could the Premier, who opposed the motion for adjournment, expect a poor

unfortunate like me to grasp those intricate figures in so short a time?

THE PREMIER: We never gave you credit for it.

MR. MONGER: If the Premier wants me to go through those figures which the member for Coolgardie gave this evening, I will do so without many notes before me. If you want me to use statistics—

THE PREMIER: I should be infinitely better pleased if the hon. member would sit down.

MR. MONGER: No; I will not sit down.

POINT OF ORDER.

MR. WILSON: Can an hon. member move an amendment which affirms that a resolution which has already been carried by this House shall receive farther consideration?

THE SPEAKER: I did not perceive that those were the terms of the amendment.

MR. WILSON: They were the terms.

MR. F. CONNOR: It was, whether the resolution should or should not be transmitted.

MR. WILSON: The terms were that the consideration of the transmission of the resolution be delayed until the motion has been farther considered.

THE SPEAKER: Of course, that is entirely out of order. But I did not understand that to be the amendment. I thought it aimed at postponing the sending of this Message.

MR. WILSON: It was that it be farther considered.

THE SPEAKER: That certainly would be out of order.

MR. HOPKINS: That being so, I will move that the question be now put.

THE SPEAKER: Will the hon. member (Mr. Monger) read his amendment again?

MR. MONGER: With every apology to you, sir, and to the members of the Ministry, I shall not move any amendment to my own proposal. There seems to be some sort of consensus of opinion on the opposite side as to what I intended to convey.

MR. TAYLOR: You are confused.

MR. MONGER: No; I am not confused; I am in a very happy humour to-night. What I intended to convey was, that the transmission of the motion to the Federal Prime Minister be postponed, pending farther consideration.

MR. GEORGE: It is the transmission, sir. We wish to farther consider the transmission. The new cable is not yet finished.

THE SPEAKER: If the hon. member means "pending farther consideration of the resolution," that would be entirely out of order.

MR. MONGER (receiving a suggestion from a member): I have it now: "That the motion be amended by substituting the word 'Parliament' for the words 'Prime Minister.'"

THE SPEAKER: The motion now before the House is: "That this resolution be transmitted by Mr. Speaker to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth." What is the amendment the hon. member proposes to move to that?

MR. MONGER: To substitute "Parliament" for "Prime Minister."

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member can speak to that.

MR. WILSON: Can the hon. member maintain the floor of the House while he moves half-a-dozen different amendments? That was not the amendment he proposed a short time since.

THE SPEAKER: Well, it certainly was not.

MR. WILSON: Then I think he ought to sit down.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. MONGER: It is seldom I differ from the views expressed by the member for Coolgardie, a gentleman whom I have had the honour to sit beside in this House.

MR. TAYLOR: Then why do you differ from him now?

MR. MONGER: But when a reference is made to the gold-mining industry as being the only industry in Western Australia, and when he refers to it as he has done this evening, I regret I did not listen to the whole of his speech, but I believe he told to this House and told the whole of the gold-mining people of the world, that there exist in Western Australia only five per cent. of payable mines—

THE SPEAKER: I do not think that has anything to do with the question before the House.

MR. MONGER: Well, sir, I shall proceed.

THE SPEAKER: I shall use my utmost powers to put down anything in the shape of obstruction. [MEMBERS: Hear, hear.]

MR. MONGER: With every apology to you, sir, I have no desire to cause any obstruction.

MR. HASTIE: Then why do you cause it?

MR. MONGER: I do not know whether I shall be out of order in saying that I congratulate the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) on his very able speech this evening, and I congratulate him more particularly on the kindly remarks and fair references which he made to the right hon. gentleman who occupied the seat now held by our present Premier.

MR. WILSON: What has that to do with the motion?

MR. MONGER: It has a lot to do with West Australia. There is one man and there are 10 others looking after the destinies of Western Australia in the Federal Parliament. That one man is the gentleman who for 10 years ruled the destinies of Western Australia, and ruled them in a manner in which no other Premier who follows in the footsteps of my friend opposite is ever likely to rule them.

THE SPEAKER: I must insist on the hon. member confining his remarks to the amendment he proposes, which is that the word "Parliament" shall be substituted for the words "Prime Minister."

MR. MONGER: I beg to move the amendment.

MR. GEORGE seconded.

MR. HASTIE: I move that the House do now divide. I believe I am in order in so doing.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member can do that, but the motion should be that the question be now put.

MR. GEORGE: Having seconded it, I claim the right to speak.

THE SPEAKER: It must be put without debate.

MR. GEORGE: But I rose to speak to the amendment.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member did rise to speak. He seconded the amendment, as is very often done in the House, by merely bowing his head.

MR. GEORGE: Well, sir, I bow to your decision; but I assert, as a fact, that I rose to speak.

Amendment put, and a division called for by MR. GEORGE.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. GEORGE: I withdraw my call for a division.

Amendment put, and negatived on the voices.

Question (Message to be forwarded) put, and a division taken.

[A Member entered through the Bar, and passed to the Ministerial side, after direction had been given to "lock the doors."]

MR. F. CONNOR: I challenge the vote of the hon. member, Mr. Johnson.

THE SPEAKER: Did the hon. member cross over?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. WILSON: The hon. member did not cross over: he came in through the Bar.

MR. HOPKINS: On a point of order— (General laughter). The "empty laugh that speaks the vacant mind."

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The hon. member (Mr. Johnson) was in the Library, and came in under the Bar.

THE SPEAKER: Did the hon. member come in after the Bar was closed.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Yes.

THE SPEAKER: Then the hon. member cannot vote.

MR. JOHNSON retired.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	15
Noes	14
		7		—
Majority for ...				1

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Connor
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. George
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Harper
Mr. Kingsmill	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Leake	Mr. Jacoby
Dr. McWilliams	Mr. Monger
Mr. Morgans	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Oats	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Reid	Mr. Rason
Mr. Reside	Mr. Smith
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Stone
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Yelverton (Teller).
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	

Question thus passed.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH LANDS AMENDMENT BILL (PRIVATE).

Received from the Legislative Council.

THE SPEAKER: I have frequently called attention to the fact that members bringing forward Bills in another place should

arrange with a member here to conduct the Bill through this House.

HON. F. H. PIESSE (after a pause): I move that the Bill be now read a first time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a first time.

MOTION—SANITARY SITE AT NORTH PERTH, TO INQUIRE.

DR. MCWILLIAMS (North Perth): As this motion will not detain hon. members long, I beg to move:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the question of the removal of the City Sanitary Depot from its present position, and to recommend a suitable site for such purpose.

This depot has been used for something over ten years, and the whole of the night-soil of the city of Perth has been placed there, also a considerable amount of refuse, as well as numbers of dead animals of all descriptions picked up from the streets of Perth. This site is of considerable elevation, standing on one of the highest parts of the city of Perth, on the Wanneroo Road, and adjoining a large lake. The drainage from this site has percolated the soil in various directions and gone into the lake. This site has been responsible for a great deal of the disease in that locality. During the time I have been resident in this State, some 10 or 11 years, I have noticed the prevalence of disease in that particular quarter of the city. There have been numerous petitions presented in regard to the site, and promises have been given that something would be done. It was simply a temporary site set apart for depositing the nightsoil. The people in the district are up in arms against this site, and have been for some considerable time, as it has prevented population in that direction. The trend of the population of the city is in a northerly and westerly direction, and the land is locked up there for the time being on account of this sanitary site for the city. If a select committee were appointed, something could be done. Some better scheme might be brought forward for the disposal of the soil. Although this site might have been suitable nine or ten years ago, it is not so now, being in the centre of a thickly-populated district. I need not dwell on the matter farther, but I feel it is a

matter of pressing necessity, not for only our city, but for the adjoining suburb of Leederville, which borders on that particular area. That is all I wish to say on the subject. I hope the motion will be carried, and that members will be appointed on the committee who know something about this subject.

MR. WILSON (Perth): I beg to second the motion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake): I desire to support the motion brought forward by the hon. member, and I thank him for doing so. It will be very much in the interests of Perth.

Question put and passed.

Ballot taken and committee appointed, comprising Mr. Daglish, Dr. Hicks, Dr. O'Connor, Mr. Wilson, with Dr. McWilliams as mover; to report on the 6th November.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11:36 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 24th October, 1901.

Papers presented—Question: Agricultural Show, Attendance—Criminal Code Bill, third reading—Supply Bill, £500,000, second reading, in Committee, reported—Annual Estimates (debate), fourth day; Votes passed, first to Attorney General, progress—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: Correspondence as to Coolgardie Water Scheme.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Papers, Dismissal of warder at Fremantle Prison. Ordered to lie on the table.