

"ance of a Resident Magistrate or of the police is frequently invoked by the Board for the purpose of greater security. This assistance has always been given promptly, in the most ungrudging manner, and gratuitously; indeed, if the Board had to pay for the machinery by which its work is effected, but little money would remain for the purposes of the work itself." Again he says:— "However, as I have already pointed out, the Board is to a very large extent dependent upon the Government of the day for its power of doing good, and if unfortunately that Government should be actuated by feelings of hostility against the aboriginal population, and declined to render such assistance to the Board as I have shown to be absolutely essential to the performance of its duties, undoubtedly a deadlock would ensue, and much suffering might arise amongst the indigent aborigines." I hope hon. members will not think I am actuated by any desire to reflect on the Board, but I say it never ought to have been brought into existence. If we do not move in the matter ourselves, we shall wait a long time before anything is done, and therefore I hope hon. members will accord me their support and concur with the message that has been sent down to us from the Lower House.

Question—That the resolution be agreed to—put.

The Council divided.

Ayes	...	...	...	6
Noes	...	...	...	5

Majority for ... 1

AYES.	NOES.
The Hon. G. Glyde	The Hon. J. G. H. Amherst
The Hon. E. Hamersley	The Hon. H. Anstey
The Hon. R. W. Hardey	The Hon. G. W. Leake
The Hon. S. H. Parker	The Hon. J. Morrison
The Hon. G. Randell	The Hon. E. T. Hooley
The Hon. D. K. Congdon (Teller.)	(Teller.)

Question put and passed.

#### FREMANTLE WATER SUPPLY BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

#### LOAN BILL, 1893.

##### THIRD READING.

This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 5:30 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Monday, 25th September, at 8 o'clock p.m.

#### Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 21st September, 1893.

Homesteads Bill: further considered in committee—  
Tariff Bill: further considered in committee—  
Message from the Legislative Council: proposed abolition of the Aborigines Protection Board—  
Message from the Legislative Council: agreeing to Fremantle Water Works Bill and Loan Bill—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### HOMESTEADS BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

New clauses:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), without comment, moved that the following new clause proposed to stand part of the Bill, viz:—"Clause 46 of the Land Regulations is hereby repealed, and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:—  
"(1.) Every agricultural area shall be gazetted in the *Government Gazette*, and with the exception of those portions applied for and held under Clause 49 as amended by this Act, and under Clauses 54 and 55 of the Land Regulations, shall be disposed of under the following conditions:—

"(a.) The price of land shall be fixed by the Governor in Council, but shall not be less than ten shillings an acre, payable in twenty yearly instalments or sooner, as prescribed by these Regulations.

"(b.) No person under the age of eighteen years shall be eligible to obtain a license to occupy land.

- "(c.) The maximum quantity held  
 "by one person shall not ex-  
 "ceed one thousand acres, and  
 "the minimum, except in  
 "special cases, approved by  
 "the Commissioner, shall not  
 "be less than one hundred  
 "acres.
- "(d.) Not more than one sub-divi-  
 "sion within an area shall be  
 "included in any one applica-  
 "tion, unless the sub-divisions  
 "applied for adjoin and lie  
 "side by side and together  
 "form one complete block.  
 "The first year's instalment,  
 "as prescribed by Clause 101  
 "of these Regulations, shall  
 "accompany each applica-  
 "tion.
- "(e.) Upon the approval of the appli-  
 "cation by the Commissioner,  
 "a lease shall be issued for  
 "twenty years.
- "(f.) Within six months of the ap-  
 "proval by the Commissioner  
 "the lessee shall commence  
 "to reside on some portion of  
 "the land held by him, resid-  
 "ing upon it and making it  
 "his usual home without any  
 "other habitual residence for  
 "the first five years of his  
 "lease, during which time he  
 "shall fence in the whole of  
 "the land on the surveyed  
 "boundaries, or, in special  
 "cases, as near thereto as  
 "shall be approved of by the  
 "Commissioner; the fence to  
 "be of the description pre-  
 "scribed by the interpretation  
 "clause of these Regulations.  
 "Provided that the Commis-  
 "sioner, on the application of  
 "the lessee, may grant an  
 "exemption from fencing any  
 "part of the land which has  
 "frontage to a permanent  
 "river, creek, or other natural  
 "boundary held by the Com-  
 "missioner to be sufficient.  
 "Provided further, that not  
 "less than one-tenth of the  
 "quantity held by the lessee  
 "be fenced in within the first  
 "two years. A statutory de-  
 "claration shall be furnished  
 "to the Commissioner on or  
 "before the 1st of March in  
 "each of the first five years  
 "of the lease as to residence  
 "and improvement. A form  
 "of declaration will be found  
 "in Schedule No. 16 of the  
 "Land Regulations.
- "(g.) In the event of the required  
 "improvements and condi-  
 "tions not being completed  
 "at the end of two years, or  
 "five years, as the case may  
 "be, or on breach of the con-  
 "ditions of residence, the land  
 "shall be forfeited to the  
 "Crown together with any  
 "improvements existing upon  
 "it.
- "(h.) At the expiration of the lease,  
 "or at any time after five  
 "years from the date of the  
 "lease, provided that the re-  
 "quired fencing is in good  
 "order, and that an amount  
 "equal to the full purchase  
 "money has been expended  
 "on the land in prescribed  
 "improvements in addition  
 "to the cost of such fencing,  
 "and further provided the full  
 "purchase money has been  
 "paid, a Crown grant shall  
 "issue.
- "(i.) If the required improvements  
 "and conditions have not been  
 "fulfilled at the end of the  
 "lease, or if at any time the  
 "annual instalment is not paid  
 "as required by these Regula-  
 "tions, the lease shall be for-  
 "feited, and shall thereupon  
 "revert to the Crown.
- "(j.) If any lessee shall die or be  
 "declared a lunatic before the  
 "fulfilment of the prescribed  
 "conditions of residence and  
 "fencing, his land may, with  
 "the approval of the Com-  
 "missioner, be held by his re-  
 "presentatives or their assigns  
 "subject to the fulfilment by  
 "them of all unfulfilled con-  
 "ditions except the condition  
 "of residence; but in trust  
 "for, and for the benefit of  
 "the persons rightfully en-  
 "titled.

"(2.) Any person possessed of rural land in fee or special occupation license under previous Regulations within the South-West Division, or who may be the holder of a lease of such land from the owner and residing upon a portion of such land, shall be allowed to become a conditional purchaser subject to all the conditions, with the exception of residence (which, however, shall be on the land already held by him in fee or special occupation license or leasehold), prescribed by Clause forty-six of the Land Regulations. Provided that the land applied for shall not be more than ten miles from such residence"—be withdrawn.

Question put and passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill, to stand as Clause 32:—"32. Clauses forty-six and forty-seven of the Land Regulations are hereby repealed, and the provisions contained in the two next following sections are substituted in lieu thereof; but such repeal shall not affect any rights, claims, or liabilities already acquired, accrued, or incurred under such Clause." He thought these new clauses would better carry out the object they had in view, and also the views expressed by members the other day. He thought, himself, it was rather a blot upon the Regulations that a man should have fifteen years to make his improvements.

Clause put and passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, without comment, that the following new clause be added to the Bill, to stand as Clause 33:—"33. Every Agricultural Area shall be gazetted in the *Government Gazette*, and may be disposed of under the following conditions:—

"(1.) The price of land shall be fixed by the Governor in Council, but shall not be less than ten shillings an acre, payable in twenty yearly instalments or sooner, as prescribed.

"(2.) No person under the age of eighteen years shall be eligible to obtain a lease, and the maximum quantity held by one person shall not exceed one thousand acres, and the minimum, except in

"special cases, approved by the Minister, shall not be less than 100 acres.

"(3.) The first year's instalment, as prescribed by Clause one hundred and one of the Land Regulations, shall accompany each application; and on approval of the application by the Minister, a lease shall be issued for 20 years, to date from the first day of January or the first day of July next preceding the date of the approval of the application.

"(4.) The lessee shall, within six months from the date of approval by the Minister, take in his own person possession of the land, and shall reside upon it and make it his usual home without any other habitual residence, during at least six months in each year, for the first five years from the date of the commencement of his lease, and if possession be not taken as aforesaid the land shall be forfeited.

"(5.) The lessee shall, within two years from the date of the commencement of his lease, fence in at least one-tenth of the quantity contained in his lease, and within five years from the said date shall fence in the whole of the land, and within ten years from the said date shall expend upon the land upon improvements prescribed by the Land Regulations an amount equal to the full purchase money, in addition to the cost of the exterior fencing.

"(6.) In the event of the required fencing not being completed at the end of two years or five years, as the case may be, or on breach of the condition of residence, or if the required improvements have not been completed within ten years, or if at any time the annual instalment is not

"paid as required by the  
"Land Regulations, the lease  
"shall be forfeited to the  
"Crown together with any  
"improvements existing upon  
"it.

"(7.) At the expiration of the lease,  
"or at any time after five  
"years from the date of the  
"commencement of the lease,  
"provided that all the condi-  
"tions of residence, fencing,  
"and improvement have been  
"complied with, and the said  
"fencing and improvement  
"maintained, and also that  
"the full purchase money has  
"been paid, a Crown grant for  
"the land shall issue.

"(8.) The Minister, on the applica-  
"tion of the lessee, may grant  
"an exemption from fencing  
"any part of the land which  
"has frontage to a permanent  
"river, creek, or other natural  
"boundary considered by the  
"Minister to be sufficient.  
"The fence shall in all other  
"cases be erected on the sur-  
"veyed boundary line, or in  
"special cases as near thereto  
"as shall be approved of by  
"the Minister, and shall be  
"of the description prescribed  
"by the Land Regulations.

"(9.) Any person having obtained  
"land of less extent than  
"one thousand acres may  
"make other applications for  
"quantities not exceeding on  
"the whole the maximum  
"quantity of one thousand  
"acres.

"(10.) A statutory declaration, in the  
"form prescribed by Sche-  
"dule No. Sixteen of the  
"Land Regulations, shall be  
"furnished to the Minister on  
"or before the 1st of March  
"in each of the first five  
"years of the lease, and at  
"the end of the tenth year,  
"and also when applying for  
"the Crown grant, setting  
"forth that the required con-  
"ditions of residence, fenc-  
"ing, and improvement have  
"been fulfilled.

"(11.) If any lessee shall die or be  
"declared a lunatic before the  
"fulfilment of the prescribed  
"conditions of residence, fenc-  
"ing, and improvement, his  
"land may, with the approval  
"of the Minister, be held by  
"his representatives or their  
"assigns subject to the ful-  
"filment by them of all un-  
"fulfilled conditions except  
"the condition of residence;  
"but in trust for, and for the  
"benefit of the persons right-  
"fully entitled."

Clause put and passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest)  
moved, without comment, that the fol-  
lowing new clause be added to the Bill, to  
stand as Clause 34:—"34. Any person  
"possessed of rural land in fee or special  
"occupation under previous Regulations  
"within the South-West Division, or who  
"may be the holder of a lease of such  
"land from the owner and resides upon  
"a portion of such land, shall be allowed  
"to become a conditional purchaser of  
"land situated either within or without  
"an Agricultural Area, subject to all the  
"conditions, with the exception of resi-  
"dence (which, however, shall be on  
"the land already held by him in fee,  
"special occupation, or leasehold), pre-  
"scribed by the next preceding section of  
"this Act. Provided that the land ap-  
"plied for shall not be more than ten  
"miles from such residence; and if the  
"land is not surveyed, the time from  
"which the conditions date shall be  
"the date of survey instead of the  
"date of the commencement of the  
"lease."

Clause put and passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest)  
moved that the following new clause be  
added to the Bill, to stand as Clause 38:  
—"38. In Clauses forty-eight, forty-nine,  
"and fifty of the Land Regulations, Sec-  
"tion thirty-three of this Act is substituted  
"for Clause forty-six of the Land Regu-  
"lations."

Question put and passed.

Ordered—That, in consequence of the  
insertion of new clauses, the clauses of  
the Bill be renumbered accordingly where  
necessary.

Bill reported, with amendments.

TARIFF BILL.  
IN COMMITTEE.

This Bill was further considered in committee.

Item — "Hides (green), per hide 1s. 6d." (as recommended in His Excellency the Governor's Message):

MR. PATERSON moved that the item be struck out. He understood that green hides were not produced in the colony, and he thought it was not right to put a duty upon them. At present they were admitted free, and he saw no reason why they should be removed from the free list. The Commission, he noticed, had recommended an *ad valorem* duty of 5 per cent., but the Government put on 1s. 6d. per hide, which, he thought, was not justified.

MR. RICHARDSON thought that perhaps a specific duty would be better than an *ad valorem* duty.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the reason why the Government had placed this duty upon green hides was because they had been informed by those engaged in the business that these hides could be produced in the colony. He noticed that last year the declared value of hides imported into the colony was £624. Assuming, as he did, that we could produce these hides in the colony, he did not see why the grazier should not have some encouragement as well as other classes of the community. He did not think the proposed duty was an unreasonable one. The Government did not care much for it, one way or the other; but representations had been made to them that the place was inundated with hides from the other colonies. That was the reason why they had put this duty upon them.

MR. MONGER said he was very pleased that a duty had been imposed upon these articles, as it must prove of some slight benefit to the pastoral industry.

MR. A. FORREST said that owing to the large amount of meat that was sent away to England from the other colonies the prices of hides had been greatly reduced. The local producers had asked the Government for a higher rate of duty to enable them to compete with these imported hides.

MR. RICHARDSON said it had been made an accusation against the Com-

mission that they had studied the growers and pastoralists too much, but he pointed out that this was an instance in which they had not studied the graziers. The hon. member for Kimberley had been one of the accusers of the Commission in this respect, yet the hon. member had the temerity to propose a duty in favour of the pastoralist himself.

MR. CLARKSON thought it was perfectly right that a duty should be placed on hides. It would be a different thing if there were no hides produced in the colony.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he believed this impost had been investigated by the hon. member for West Kimberley, who generally had an eye to the main chance, and who introduced a deputation to the Premier on the subject. He believed that it was intended that a new tannery business should be established in Perth. He thought it would be better if members, in dealing with this tariff, would avoid anything savouring of personal benefit. The class of hides which this duty would affect were hides that could not be produced in the colony, owing, he believed, to climatic influences. The hides imported were imported for a special purpose, and weighed on an average about 70lbs., while those produced in the colony only weighed from 45lbs. to 50lbs.

MR. LOTON said that at the beginning of the present year hides were worth 12s. each, but at the present time they were nearly unsaleable, from some cause or another. He did not quite understand the reason of this fluctuation, unless it was that the market was glutted with imported hides. He was favourable to a fair duty being charged.

MR. PEARSE said there was no doubt that the market was glutted with hides at the present time; but whatever duty was put upon them, the trade must have them.

MR. A. FORREST said he believed in making money for himself and his fellow men. He did not hoard it up like the hon. member for Gascoyne. Whether he was interested in a tannery company or not, he thought that in supporting the duty he was doing a good to the country.

MR. DEHAMEL said he regarded the duty as a purely protective one, and as such would oppose it. The more they

went into this tariff, the more complicated things became. It reminded him of a transformation scene in a pantomime.

MR. MOLLOY said he did not object to this article contributing its fair share to the revenue, but he considered the duty proposed was too high. It was equal to 25 per cent., which was excessive. He thought it would be better to place it on the *ad valorem* list, rather than have a specific duty upon it. He would be prepared to support a 10 per cent. duty.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said if these hides were only worth 12s. 6d. each, the proposed duty would only be equal to  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., and not 25 per cent.

Motion to strike out the item negatived.

Item put and passed.

Item—"Iron (galvanised, corrugated), per ton, £1 : "

MR. TRAYLEN thought it would have been better to have kept this item at the higher rate now charged upon it, and allow that which could not be manufactured in the colony to have come in at a lower rate.

MR. MONGER said that galvanised iron was an article that was used by everybody in the colony, and he should be sorry to see this high duty upon it. He moved that it be reduced by 10s.

Question put and negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item—"Meat (preserved), per lb.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  d. : "

MR. MONGER said he was surprised that the Government should have rejected the recommendation of the Commission with respect to this article. It was an article that was an absolute necessity for a large section of the community, who had occasion to dwell or travel in the wilds of the country, and especially during the summer months, when fresh meat would not keep. He thought it was unreasonable to ask the House to agree to such a duty as this. We could not turn out these preserved meats in this colony, as they did in Queensland and other colonies. If we could, he would not object to this duty; or even if there was any probability of any attempt being made to start the industry. He moved that the proposed duty be reduced by 1d., which would virtually leave the duty as it was at present, namely  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. *ad valorem*.

MR. A. FORREST said he was opposed to the reduction. He did not think they ought to encourage the consumption of these tinned meats. In Queensland they had a duty of 4d.

MR. MONGER: Because they have factories there.

MR. A. FORREST thought that the duty proposed by the Government,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  d. per lb., was a fair thing, seeing that in Victoria it was 2d. a lb., and in New South Wales 1d. per lb.

MR. DEHAMEL hoped the Government would support a reduction, as this was one of the foods of the people, and an absolute necessity.

MR. CLARKSON supported the amendment of the hon. member for York. The colony was not in a position to supply canned meat, and till it was, it should be admitted as cheaply as possible.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Government had sought to encourage the local manufacture of this article. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: Let it start first]. £15,000 worth had been imported last year, yielding a duty of £1,800. If it was reduced to 1d., the revenue would suffer to the extent of £600.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: A penny would be more than double the present rate.

MR. PIESSE moved that it be reduced to 1d. He thought that would be a fair duty, and quite high enough, as this was an article that was largely consumed by people in the bush.

MR. MONGER said the present duty was equivalent to 10d. per dozen 2lb. tins. His proposal would make it equivalent to 1s. per dozen 2lb. tins. This, he thought, was ample protection.

MR. SOLOMON supported the amendment, on the ground that preserved meat was universally used in the colony, and the duty therefore should be made as low as possible.

MR. LOTON said this kind of meat could not be produced in the colony at the present time, and there was consequently no need for protection. There was a large demand for this meat. They could not send fresh meat to Yilgarn and other distant places, and therefore this meat should be made as cheap as possible.

MR. A. FORREST said that lots of people were poisoned through eating these tinned meats. He believed that

the £1,800 received by way of duty from the importation of this article last year was more than absorbed to provide hospital treatment for people who ate the meat.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said this would not affect the producer, but the consumer, and he would like to see the meat on the free list. The duty was not wanted for the revenue, because the revenue was served by other items; it was not wanted for protective purposes, because there was no necessity for protection.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said hon. members wanted to give away everything. He asked why some revenue should not be derived from this item, and why the miner should not contribute his quota to the revenue from this source. People living in the country did not pay the taxes that the people in the towns did, and he saw no reason why they should not pay a tax on this. He contended, however, that this article entered into competition with fresh meats, as large quantities were consumed in the towns. The Government was willing to reduce the duty to 1d., but no lower.

MR. MOLLOY asked, if it was only required to maintain the same amount of revenue from this article as was received last year, why should the Government seek to double the amount of the duty.

MR. SIMPSON said the Ministry seemed to be developing, distinctly, upon every item, a desire to increase the duty on the necessities of life for the poorer people. [THE PREMIER: Your Commission recommended 1d.] The hon. gentleman had discharged a bombshell in the Assembly the other day in the form of a Message increasing the duty on tea and sugar and other things. If the Government could change its mind so quickly, surely a member of the Commission might do so also. It so happened, however, that he did not support the decision of the Commission in this respect. He opposed the Government proposal, which meant, according to the calculations of the hon. member (Mr. Monger), nearly 500 per cent. increase upon what was an absolute necessary of life in the back blocks of the country—which he thought was an unholy thing for any Government to do.

MR. LEFROY understood that the object of appointing the Tariff Commis-

sion was, not to increase the revenue, but to remove certain anomalies, and to give encouragement to local industries. There was no local industry to protect in this case, and he thought they might allow this item to go with a half-penny duty.

MR. MONGER, in reply to what had fallen from the Premier, said that so far as he could remember, the last invoice from America was priced at 1½ dollars per dozen 2lb. tins, cases included, delivered on board at New York. The duty on this was equivalent to 7½d. as against 3s. as proposed.

The committee divided on the motion to reduce the duty by one penny, with the following result:—

Ayes...	...	...	11
Noes...	...	...	15

Majority against ... 4

AYES.  
Mr. Clarkson  
Mr. Darlöt  
Mr. DeHamel  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Molloy  
Mr. Pearse  
Mr. R. F. Sholl  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. Monger (Teller).

NOES.  
Mr. Cookworthy  
Sir J. Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Paterson  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Piessé  
Mr. Quinlan  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Sir J. G. Lee Steere  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. Traylen (Teller).

Question put and negatived.

MR. MONGER moved that the duty be reduced by ½d. He thought they might fairly agree to meet half way.

Question put and passed.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item—"Meat (fresh), per lb. 1½d.":

MR. MOLLOY moved that the duty be reduced by ¼d. He did not see the necessity of imposing such a heavy duty upon what was an absolute necessary of life.

Question put and negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item—"Oats, per bushel 4d.":

MR. RICHARDSON moved that the duty be reduced by 1d. He thought the Government might, as regards this item, agree to the recommendation of the Commission. There was a large section of the community who required oats, and it was acknowledged that we could not grow it here anything in comparison with what they could in New Zealand. He thought the public ought not to be mulcted, because of the climatic drawbacks of the

colony, as regards the production of this cereal.

MR. MONGER said he would be very pleased to support the amendment. He would gladly have supported a larger reduction. It was a grain which, it was well known, could not be successfully produced in the colony, and it was used everywhere. He thought, as they had already protected the agriculturists of the colony by increasing the duties on several articles of produce, they could afford this reduction in the duty on oats.

MR. LEFROY could not understand a member representing an agricultural district being so inconsistent as to support a reduction in the duty on this cereal. He thought 4d. a bushel was a very fair and reasonable duty in proportion to that on wheat. He could not admit that we could not grow oats in this colony. We could grow very good brown oats, which made better horse feed than the New Zealand oat, and he should like to see oat-growing more encouraged in the colony.

MR. A. FORREST opposed the amendment on the ground that it was only fair and reasonable that the local growers should be protected as regards this product as well as other agricultural products.

MR. CLARKSON said he also must oppose the proposed reduction. It was nonsense to say that we could not produce oats in this colony. They could grow oats to the extent of 20 bushels to the acre in the Toodyay district.

MR. PATERSON thought it would be far better for our farmers if they paid more attention to the growing of oats. It was always wheat, wheat, wheat, with the majority of them, instead of going in for a rotation of crops, which would give them more satisfactory results. In order to encourage them to do this, he was sorry he could not support this reduction.

MR. HARPER asked if oats could be grown here, why they were not grown. Even if an extra penny a bushel was put on, it would not prevent the importation, as it was beyond question that oats could not be grown here so as to compete with the imported article. He therefore thought it was reasonable to reduce this duty.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that £28,404 worth of oats were im-

ported last year, and yielded £3,772 in duty. He should like to see this extensive importation of an agricultural produce checked. He was surprised to hear that oats could not be grown here. No doubt such heavy crops were not obtained here, as at other places, and the farmer could, therefore, not compete with the imported article, as it was introduced very cheaply. If the amendment was carried, over £1,000 would be lost to the revenue. The Government only proposed to leave the duty as it was before.

MR. LEFROY said he thought the reason why oats had not been more grown was because they could not be produced so cheaply as they could be imported. At the same time, oats could be grown, and he and others in his district had proved this, as they grew them on their land. He advocated that protection should be given to this industry as well as to other industries.

MR. COOKWORTHY said the real truth was oats were largely grown, but they were turned into hay, as it was thought it paid better. He had seen acres under oats, only a few days ago.

MR. RICHARDSON said they had been protecting many sections of the community, and surely all sections were entitled to some protection. He reminded the committee there was a large section of the community, the teamsters, who were engaged in carting supplies to our goldfields, and in carting our wool to market, upon whom this duty would press heavily. Why should not they be afforded some protection by allowing them this slight concession of a penny a bushel on oats—the only feed they could manage to carry for their horses.

MR. HARPER said the real secret of oats not being more largely grown in the colony was the fact of our season being too short for growing white oats successfully; and the cost of harvesting also militated against it. You could not profitably strip oats, like barley and wheat, and consequently it entailed a considerably greater amount of labour.

At 6:30 p.m., the Chairman left the chair for an hour. On the committee resuming.

MR. CLARKSON, continuing the debate on the amendment, said it was entirely a mistake to suppose that oats could not be grown in this colony. He



had grown 50 bushels to the acre, and had some oats this year which would probably go 40 bushels to the acre. What the colony wanted was farmers to grow them. He sympathised with the hon. member for York in saying the farmers could not grow oats in that district, because he was aware that the land about York was not anything like the land about Northam or Newcastle.

MR. THROSSELL endorsed what the last speaker had said, and added that the growing of oats should be assisted in order to keep out the enormous importations.

MR. PIESSE said the question was whether the farmers here could grow oats in competition with farmers in other colonies. The proposed duty would be a local assistance, and would not be felt by any one. Still, it would be better for the farmers to go on growing wheat, now that there were plenty of mills in the colony.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said it should be remembered that the Northern part of the colony could not produce oats, and these had to be imported. He had bought New Zealand oats at 2s. 7d. a bushel, and bags thrown in. He believed it would pay the agriculturists in this colony better to buy imported oats for feeding their working horses, and grow something else that would pay. This duty would be a mistake from a protective point of view, and it was not required for revenue purposes.

MR. MONGER said that, although oats might be grown in the colony, the farmers had not thought fit to grow them in quantity. Only 1,695 acres were in crop for oats, last year, the average yield being  $17\frac{1}{2}$  bushels to the acre, although one hon. member might be able to grow 40 bushels to the acre. Locally-grown oats were never offered for sale in Perth or Fremantle, and it was evident the local growers were unable to compete against imported oats. The 30,000 bushels produced annually in the colony would go a very small way towards supplying all the requirements. It was a mistake to protect an article the local farmers could not produce at a price that would compete with the imported article. The Commission recommended a duty of 3d. a bushel, and he was sorry the Government were trying to make the duty 4d.

MR. SIMPSON hoped the reduction would be made for assisting the carriers, omnibus drivers, and others who had to live by driving horses. This was a chance for enabling these men to save a little and put it by.

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

Ayes ...	...	...	12
Noes ...	...	...	15

Majority against 3

ATES.  
Mr. Darlöt  
Mr. DeHamel  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Molloy  
Mr. Monger  
Mr. Pearce  
Mr. Quinlan  
Mr. R. F. Sholl  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. Richardson (Teller).

NOES.  
Mr. Clarkson  
Mr. Cookworthy  
Sir John Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Piesse  
Sir J. G. Lee Steere  
Mr. Throssell  
Mr. Traylen  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. Paterson (Teller).

Amendment negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Oil (mineral), per gallon 6d.":

MR. RICHARDSON moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 3d. Light ought to be cheap. Kerosene oil was a necessity in every dwelling, and was made unnecessarily dear to the poorer class and to lonely dwellers in the bush; it was also much used as a motive power for oil engines, and as an insecticide for orchards.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the amendment would cause a loss of £2,300 a year to the revenue, and no appreciable benefit would be felt by even the poorest users of kerosene for lighting. It was curious to observe that, before the Commission brought to light this and other anomalies, no grievance was felt; and even the Commissioners blew hot and cold. If the mover of the amendment had proposed a reduction of 1d., he would have readily accepted it. This duty was an easy means of obtaining a revenue.

MR. H. W. SHOLL supported the amendment, saying kerosene was largely used in the North for preventing the ravages of white ants in timber.

MR. HARPER said the Premier's estimate of the loss in revenue was excessive. Oil engines were coming greatly into use. He had frequently seen the

price of kerosene quoted at 3d. a gallon wholesale in England and America, and the duty here was more than the cost of the oil.

MR. MONGER said a few years ago the price of the article was higher than now, and he had not heard the public express any wish for a reduction of duty on kerosene oil.

MR. SIMPSON asked the Premier to fancy the lonely homestead settler, on his 160-acre block, being unable to afford kerosene for reading the Premier's land settlement speeches, in the evening. That settler would have to go to bed with the hens at night. He was sure the present Ministry were not opposed to more light. If the proportion of the duty were equitable some years ago, why should the duty be increased when the article was cheaper?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) asked how much duty the settler would have to pay for the oil he used in a year.

MR. SIMPSON said the amount would be 10s. or 11s. This might not be much for hon. members, but to the homestead settler it meant a good deal.

MR. DEHAMEL said that for the first time on the Tariff Bill he would support the Government. He did not see the logic of the last speaker's argument that there should be a reduction in the duty because there had been a reduction in price.

MR. CLARKSON supported the reduction, as the duty was exorbitant.

MR. RICHARDSON said he could not understand the argument that a duty should be clapped on because the article was cheap.

MR. PATERSON opposed the reduction.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that in New South Wales the duty was 6d., also in Queensland, and 3d. in South Australia. The amount of duty was a small matter to the individual, but of consequence to the State.

MR. THROSSELL supported the duty.

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

Ayes	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	17

Majority against ... 7

## AYES.

Mr. Clarkson  
Mr. Connor  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Paterson  
Mr. Pearce  
Mr. R. F. Sholl  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Mr. Simpson  
Sir J. G. Lee Steere  
Mr. Richardson (Teller).

## NOES.

Mr. Cookworthy  
Mr. Darlot  
Mr. DeHamel  
Sir John Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Molloy  
Mr. Monger  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Piesse  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. Throssell  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. Traylen (Teller).

Amendment negatived.

MR. RICHARDSON moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 2d.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the committee had unmistakably shown that this reduction was not considered to be in the interest of the people. It was not worth while arguing the matter farther.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	11
Noes	...	...	...	16

Majority against ... 5

## AYES.

Mr. Clarkson  
Mr. Connor  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Paterson  
Mr. Pearce  
Mr. Piesse  
Mr. R. F. Sholl  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Mr. Simpson  
Sir J. G. Lee Steere  
Mr. Richardson (Teller).

## NOES.

Mr. Cookworthy  
Mr. Darlot  
Sir John Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Molloy  
Mr. Monger  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. Throssell  
Mr. Traylen  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. DeHamel (Teller).

Amendment negatived.

MR. SIMPSON moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 1½d.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would accept a reduction of 1d.

MR. LOTON supported the amendment, and said the first amendment would have been too sweeping in its effect on the revenue.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the present amendment would cause a loss of £1,100 or £1,200 a year in the revenue. He did not like to divide the House too often, on this question, but, without having changed his opinion, he would accept the reduction of 1½d.

Amendment put and passed, and the item amended accordingly.

Item—"Onions, per ton £1":

MR. MOLLOY moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 5s., because onions were not grown extensively in the colony, and the supply had to be imported.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) opposed the amendment, saying there were magnificent samples of onions at the local agricultural shows, and this duty was not large.

MR. COOKWORTHY said the cost of bringing onions from other colonies was less than for conveying locally-grown onions from Bunbury or the Vasse to the central districts. The market was glutted with imported onions.

MR. A. FORREST said the last speaker had voted against an increase of duty on flour, because it was not produced in his district; yet now he wanted to protect onions, which were grown at the Vasse.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Peel (drained), per lb. 1d.":

MR. PATERSON moved that the item be struck out.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) accepted the motion.

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

Item—"Potatoes, per ton £1":

MR. MOLLOY moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 5s. a ton. He said that 2,067 tons of potatoes were imported last year, proving that sufficient were not grown in the colony. An industry which did not exist could not require protecting; therefore he did not see why the consumer should be required to pay this heavy duty on a necessary of life.

MR. HARPER said the hon. member was forgetting that the opening of the South-Western Railway gave access to a potato-growing district.

MR. PIESSE said the old cry about the settlers being unable to produce articles good enough for consumption was raised again. The country could produce potatoes in every way fit for consumption, and the cultivation of the soil ought to be encouraged. He believed that if the country went in for extensive protection, although they might find at first that it pressed heavily on the consumer, yet after a time production would be so encouraged that all articles of consumption

produced here would be cheapened. Only give the people a chance, and hon. members would find that West Australia was quite capable of producing the necessities of life as well as any part of Australia.

MR. DEHAMEL was surprised at the hon. member for the Williams advocating extreme protection for non-existent industries. Free trade was undoubtedly best for young countries, and protection became justifiable only when industries had grown up and needed to be fostered. There was no increase in this duty, and he would vote for the item.

MR. COOKWORTHY admitted that the production of potatoes was insufficient, but said this was chiefly because of the difficulty of getting the article to market. The advantages of the railway were not seen fully in a year, but when once the railway was completed to the Vasse, it would be found that the South-Western districts could supply what the towns of Perth and Fremantle wanted.

MR. A. FORREST supported the duty, because the South-Western Railway had been built to bring potatoes and onions to the central markets. He was surprised, however, to see the hon. member for Sussex jumping about from side to side in the divisions, urging free trade one moment and protection another. A member ought to be one thing or the other.

MR. COOKWORTHY said the Premier, when introducing the Bill, stated that it was not a protective or a free trade Bill, but a revenue Bill. [MR. SIMPSON: A piebald Bill.] Accepting the Premier's definition, he would consider the requirements of his district in voting on the different duties.

MR. SOLOMON said the duty would not make any difference in the importations.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

New Item—"Rye, per bushel 4d.":

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, in accordance with His Excellency's Message, that this new item be inserted in the schedule.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly.

Item—"Saddles (riding), each 15s.":

MR. MONGER moved that the item be struck out. He said this large duty on saddles, being the same for the cheap as for the high-priced article, was pro-

tection with a vengeance. He particularly objected to so large a tax on low-priced saddles, which could not be made in the colony, and were a necessity to men who could not afford the superior article; therefore he moved to strike out the item, with a view to inserting it in the 20 per cent. schedule.

MR. CLARKSON supported the motion, saying it was absurd to charge the same duty on saddles worth £5 or 5s. each.

MR. A. FORREST said the local trade was swamped by the importation of cheap saddles, which were worthless for wear, and did no good to anybody. Local saddlers and tanners should be encouraged, by excluding low-priced competition.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the object of the Commission, in recommending this duty, was to put in the specific list as many articles as possible, rather than charge *ad valorem*, because by the latter plan there was much loss of revenue through the low valuations entered in invoices. The best way to protect the revenue was by making the duties specific where practicable. The duty of 15s. would be 20 per cent. on a saddle valued at 75s. He believed the very cheap saddles were bad, and ruined the horses.

MR. LOTON said the object of the Commission was laudable, but the method of effecting it did not work fairly. It was not fair to charge the same duty on low priced as on superior saddles. Some articles of clothing were put in the *ad valorem* list, and why not treat saddles in the same way?

MR. MONGER said the Premier had again reflected on the integrity of importers, in the making up of invoices; but he knew that the Collector of Customs had tested invoices by opening consignments and getting them valued, on more than one occasion; and if the Collector thought the value stated in an invoice was not sufficient, he had the option, under the law, of electing to take the under-valued articles at the invoice price, and sell them on behalf of the Government.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Collector had often to do so.

MR. MONGER said he understood it had been done only on two or three occasions.

MR. MOLLOY opposed the duty, on the ground that it was an excessive charge to impose on low-priced saddles which the poorer class of users must have. This was protection to local manufacturers, with a vengeance.

MR. RICHARDSON said saddles could be made just as well in the colony as out of it. He had bought many saddles, and had always purchased the colonial article. He thought it was well to shut out the cheap rubbish.

MR. SOLOMON asked why saddles were put in the specific list, whilst the other articles in this trade were placed in an *ad valorem* list.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	16
Noes	...	...	...	11

Majority for ... 5

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

Motion carried, and the item struck out accordingly.

Item—"Shot, per hundredweight 5s.":

MR. PIESSE moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 2s. He said the duty was excessive, being about 30 per cent., and shot were used largely in country districts.

MR. RICHARDSON said the Commission had recommended that shot be admitted at 5 per cent., because they were largely used for killing birds in orchards and vineyards. Many vineyards required four or five thousand charges in a season.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Soap, all other kinds, N.O.E., per hundredweight 5s.":

MR. DEHAMEL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 2s. This would leave the duty the same as before, and he opposed any increase, because soap was an absolute necessity.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Spirits, Spirits of Wine, Cordials, or Strong Waters of all kinds, n.o.e., for each and every imperial gallon of such spirits of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of proof, or any quantity greater or less than a gallon, per gallon 16s.":

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the item as now submitted had been altered, in accordance with His Excellency's Message, by inserting the words "Spirits of Wine" after the word "Spirits," in the first line.

MR. TRAYLEN hoped the Government had some addition to propose, for admitting spirits of wine at a less duty when imported for making essences. It was desirable to encourage local industries.

MR. MONGER supported the suggestion for exemption, as the high duty now proposed would stop the manufacture of essences in the colony.

MR. SOLOMON also supported the suggestion, saying it would be worse than folly to crush a young industry.

MR. DEHAMEL added his support.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he had no proposal to make in the direction suggested, because he did not see how to make an exceptional provision for taking spirits out of bond by a person who required them for making up essences, as distinguished from other persons. One person in the colony who was interested in the matter had called on him, but still he (the Premier) did not see how any exceptional provision could be introduced into this schedule. Such a power might be given to the Government, in a Customs Act.

MR. MONGER suggested that the words "destroyed in bond" might be added to the definition, and the operation of adding the adulterant could be performed in the presence of a Customs officer.

MR. TRAYLEN suggested that the words "provided that spirits of wine for the purpose of making essences shall be 4s. a gallon" be added to the item.

MR. PIESSE said the spirits of wine could be destroyed in bond by adding the essential oil, thus converting the spirits

into essence, after which it could be used only for the manufacture of cordials. Large quantities of essences were used in the colony.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the next item in the schedule was "Spirits of Wine," and he must be very cautious about altering the item under discussion.

MR. QUINLAN said a chemist had suggested to him that they should add the words "in quantities of not more than five gallons," for admitting spirits of wine for manufacturing purposes.

MR. SIMPSON said it would be safer to postpone the item until further information was obtained.

Item put and passed.

Item—"Spirits of Wine, per gallon £1":

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the item be postponed until after the consideration of the other schedules.

Motion put and passed, and the item postponed accordingly.

Item—"Starch, per lb. 1d.":

MR. SOLOMON moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by  $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

MR. MONGER moved that the item be struck out.

MR. SOLOMON withdrew his amendment, by leave.

Motion for striking out the item put and passed, and the item struck out accordingly.

Item—"Sugar, per hundredweight 4s. (as recommended in His Excellency's Message)":

MR. DEHAMEL moved, as an amendment, that it be reduced by 2s. He said that, on a previous evening, he was in favour of this item being increased, but that was on condition that the duty on flour should not be raised. Now that the duty on flour was increased, to be consistent he felt he must move to reduce the duty on sugar.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) opposed the reduction, saying that after the debate on the second reading, in which members generally expressed the opinion that the reduction of the duty on sugar, as first proposed in the Bill, would not benefit the consumer, the Government reconsidered the item, and decided to retain the duty at 4s. The

reduction, if carried out, would cause a loss of £4,293 on the basis of last year's importation. The Government would not be justified in losing this large amount of revenue, if the benefit was not to reach the consumer.

MR. SIMPSON said the Premier was acting the part of a fiscal acrobat, in first proposing 2s. a hundredweight, and a few days later proposing 4s. It was about time the people were told that the present Ministry were taxing the necessities of life. On the Premier's own figures, the tariff was, up to this point, £13,000 ahead of the required revenue. If a reduction would not affect the consumer, would he be affected by the duty being doubled? The Government were proposing, right through the tariff, increases which would increase the revenue by £30,000, which would be at the rate of 10s. a head increase on every man, woman, and child in the colony.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the hon. member to keep to the question.

MR. SIMPSON said he was afraid he had not been referring much to sugar. He concluded by supporting the amendment.

MR. MONGER said the hon. member for Geraldton, in his very pretty and sugary speech, did not inform the committee that storekeepers were selling sugar in retail at less than the cost price, this article being a leading line in their business; and if the duty were reduced or even wiped out, the storekeepers could not afford to further reduce the retail price of an article on which they were losing already. He supported the increase as a sensible one for raising revenue.

MR. LEFROY said that any reduction in the duty on sugar would go mainly to the brewers, and not to the retail consumers; therefore he supported the duty in the schedule.

MR. QUINLAN said the brewers were to be taxed at a higher rate by the increased duty on malt, and some assistance from sugar would be a fair compensation. He supported the amendment, as a reduction would also assist the syrup and jam industries.

MR. A. FORREST said the country could not afford to lose the revenue from sugar, when the benefit would not go to the retail consumers.

MR. CONNOR supported the amendment for reduction of duty, as a benefit to the North.

MR. RICHARDSON supported the amendment, as the reduction must reach the consumer through competition in trade.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) denied that the Government were seeking more revenue through the tariff, and said a revision of the tariff had been forced upon them by a vote of the Assembly. Now that the tariff was being revised, he wanted to keep the revenue on the safe side, and if any increase of revenue could be obtained as the result of this revision, without oppressing the people, he did not see why such increase should not be obtained, in order that there might be more to spend in satisfying those claims and wants which were pressed on the Government from every part of the colony, and from almost every member of the House. Even the hon. member for Geraldton, who made this unreasonable charge against the Government, was among those who asked for more expenditure in his district—if not for a railway, yet for other things.

MR. SIMPSON said he had never asked for a railway since he came into the House.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that every member required something; and there being so many demands on the revenue, he was loth to lose any when there was no necessity to do so. Why should the Government lose the revenue on sugar and tea? Some hon. members wished to throw away £6,000 or £7,000 a year, although the people had not complained in respect of the particular items. The Government wanted a great deal more revenue than they had got, for meeting demands which came from all parts of the colony.

MR. CLARKSON moved that the committee do now divide.

Motion put and passed.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	9
Noes	...	...	...	19
				—
Majority against			...	10

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

Amendment negatived.

MR. SIMPSON moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 1s.

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

Ayes ...	10
Noes ...	17

Majority against ... 7

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

Amendment negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Tea, per lb. 4d. (in accordance with His Excellency's Message):"

MR. DEHAMEL moved, as an amendment, that the duty be reduced by 1d. He said the Commission had recommended this reduction, and the Government ought to have accepted it.

MR. QUINLAN supported the reduction, and said the same arguments that had been applied for reducing the duty on sugar would apply also to tea. He said the hon. member for York was a Gladstone in his way, for he had applied the closure to every member but himself, and yet had been occupying the time of the House for the most part of two days.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) opposed the amendment, saying it would cause a loss of £2,286 in the revenue,

on the basis of last year's importations; and the reduction, if made, would not be felt appreciably by retail consumers, as the hon. member for the Swan had stated on a previous evening. Tea brought a large sum to the revenue, because every person used it.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the Government had been imposing higher duties all round, and when this Bill came into operation the taxation of the people would be considerably increased. He did not think it well that the Government should have too much money to fool away, as they had been doing, by wasting money all over the country.

MR. RICHARDSON said this was the most heavily taxed community in Australia, and, when this Tariff Bill was passed, the people of Western Australia would be the most heavily taxed in the world.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the recommendations of the Commission would increase the taxation by £15,000 a year.

MR. RICHARDSON said the Commission had regulated the taxation so as not to tax necessities of life. Beer was not a necessary of life. Wherever the Commission had attempted to largely reduce the duties on the necessities of life, there the Government had reversed the recommendation; and yet the Premier said the Commission were increasing the taxation! There were 25 articles in the 10 per cent. schedule which the Commission had recommended to be placed in the 5 per cent. schedule, and they also recommended large reductions in the specific list, on necessities of life. The Government had opposed all these; and yet the Premier dared to twit the Commission with increasing the taxation of the people. The Commission did not arrange the tariff in such a clod-hopper, rule-of-thumb style as this. If the Government had honestly said, at first, they required more revenue from taxation, and had given reasons for it, the House would have had something definite to go upon, in increasing the duties. The increases should not be made by a side-wind, in a hole-and-corner sort of way.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) asked which was the hole-and-corner way.

MR. RICHARDSON begged pardon. He meant by a side issue that did not appear on the face. The Government should not say they wanted more taxation, and in the same breath accuse the Commission of bringing it in.

MR. LEFROY said he was convinced now that it had been a mistake to vote for the appointment of a Tariff Commission. He felt sympathy with the Commission in their present position, and he also felt sympathy with the Government. The revision of the tariff should always be a matter of Government policy, on which they should stand or fall; and the question should not be dealt with as if the country were still under the old form of Government. The very chairman of the Commission had not been in favour of a Commission being appointed, when the motion for that purpose was under discussion.

MR. HASSELL moved that the committee do now divide.

MR. SIMPSON said he would call for a division on the question as to whether the committee was to divide. If the Government wished the gag, he could understand this attempt to stop discussion. It was a part of the Government policy to apply the gag. An attack was made on the Commission by the member for the Moore, and instead of allowing it to be answered the gag was applied.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this was unbearable. The Government had not called for a division. Why should the hon. member for Geraldton say the Government had gagged the House? The Government had done nothing in the matter. An independent member of the House had called for a division, and then the hon. member for Geraldton jumped up and said this was the Government gag.

THE CHAIRMAN put the motion that the committee do now divide.

MR. SIMPSON called for a division on this motion.

Division taken, the numbers being:—

For ...	...	...	15
Against ...	...	...	11

Majority for ... 4

AYES.  
Sir John Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Molloy  
Mr. Paterson  
Mr. Pearce  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Piesse  
Mr. Quinlan  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. Throssell  
Mr. Traylen  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. Clarkson (Teller).

NOES.  
Mr. Connor  
Mr. Darlôt  
Mr. DeHamel  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Monger  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. R. F. Sholl  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Mr. Simpson (Teller).

Motion for taking a division carried. The committee accordingly divided on the main question—MR. DEHAMEL's amendment for reducing the duty by 1d.—with the following result:—

Ayes ...	...	...	10
Noes ...	...	...	17

Majority against ... 7

AYES.  
Mr. Connor  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Pearce  
Mr. Quinlan  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. R. F. Sholl  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. DeHamel (Teller).

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

Amendment negatived, and the item passed.

Item — "Tobacco (unmanufactured), per lb. 2s." :

MR. SOLOMON moved that the duty be reduced by 3d. He said the firm which had started a tobacco manufactory at Fremantle laid out over £30,000; they brought into the colony about 50 persons who had been employed elsewhere in this kind of manufacture, and these with their families numbered about 70 persons; the weekly pay-sheet at the start showed about £90 paid in wages; but the Government suddenly raised the duty on imported leaf tobacco from 1s. to 2s. a pound, thus seriously interfering with the industry.

MR. TRAYLEN said that, having supported an industry for the manufacture of essences, he must be consistent by also supporting the tobacco industry. He would prefer to increase the duty on the manufactured article, but the only course open to him was to support this amendment. He was satisfied that the Fremantle factory produced as good an article as any factory in the world.



MR. PIESSE said the reduction of duty would assist the local factory, and thus benefit the country.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this reduction would seriously affect the revenue. Since the tobacco factory at Fremantle began operations, the revenue received from the duties on tobacco was certainly £5,000 a year less than before the local manufacture was commenced. How could hon. members make it appear that this proposed reduction of duty on the imported leaf would be a benefit to the country, by taking the revenue from the Government and giving it to this factory? Notwithstanding the increase of population since the factory started, yet the revenue from tobacco received at the Customs was not increasing proportionately. Some hon. members wanted the revenue to suffer, merely for the benefit of individuals. He had not seen any facts of a reliable nature to prove that the present margin of duty between the imported and the manufactured article was not sufficient for enabling the local manufacturer to make a good living in this colony. He was inclined to think it was, for if the manufacturer had not done very well he did not see how the revenue could have suffered so much as it had done. If the firm were losing and the Government were losing, then who was gaining? Some one must be gaining. The Customs revenue from tobacco was most unsatisfactory, and particularly during the last two years. He was not inclined to believe the firm were losing by the manufacture. But the first concern of the Government was to protect the revenue. He could not accept the amendment.

MR. CLARKSON said a gentleman connected with the factory at Fremantle had told him the firm were losing money. If, as the Premier said, the Government were also losing revenue on tobacco, the best thing would be to let the firm die, if the result of this local industry was a loss to everybody.

MR. MONGER regretted that the Government would not support one of the few industries in the colony. The Premier told them the other evening that there had been a loss of £9,000 from the falling off in the tobacco revenue during the last two years. Well, it had come to his notice that a person in Bunbury—

the Premier's own constituency—was offering American tobacco at a less price than the actual duty chargeable on it. A parcel of tobacco was offered by a person in the Bunbury district to a person in Fremantle at 2s. 9d. per pound. Whether it was fair to allege that the loss of revenue was attributable to the Fremantle factory he would leave to the judgment of the House, when tobacco which ought to bear a duty of 3s. a pound could be sold for 2s. 9d. a pound, leaving a profit to the vendor at that price. He would like to see this industry supported, the same as it was in other colonies.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the duty on tobacco in Tasmania and in Queensland was the same as in this colony.

MR. SOLOMON said there was also an Excise duty on leaf tobacco in other colonies.

Amendment put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Woolbales, each 4d." :

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved that the duty be reduced by 2d. Cornsacks were in the 5 per cent. list, and he did not see why woolpacks should be charged at the high rate of 20 per cent.

MR. PIESSE supported the amendment.

MR. CLARKSON opposed the amendment, saying the House should not be dictated to by a few bloated squatters from the North.

MR. SIMPSON supported the amendment.

MR. A. FORREST said those who had to pay the duty on woolpacks did not object to it. The difficulty was to find the wool to put into the bales. Personally, the duty would make many pounds of difference to him, but he waived that consideration.

MR. RICHARDSON said he did not care whether the duty was 2d., 4d., or 6d. The Commission wanted to be consistent in recommending a reduction.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this was a small matter, and the mover of the amendment was making too much of it. Woolbales were placed in the specific list because they could not be classed with bags generally.

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

Ayes ...	...	...	10
Noes ...	...	...	15

Majority against ... 5

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

Amendment negatived, and the item passed.

THE CHAIRMAN said the last item in the First Schedule had been disposed of, but there being a postponed item, the schedule could not be added to the Bill, at present.

MR. SOLOMON moved that progress be now reported, and leave asked to sit again.

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

Ayes ...	...	...	7
Noes ...	...	...	18

Majority against ... 11

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

Motion negatived.

## SECOND SCHEDULE—5 PER CENT. *ad valorem*.

Item—"Artificers' Tools of Trade and parts thereof":

MR. PIESSE moved, as an amendment, that the words "of Trade" be struck out. He desired to include axes, mattocks, and handles as being necessary tools in farming districts.

MR. HARPER said the Commission adopted this definition from the New South Wales Act. He suggested that the words "and Labourers" be inserted after the word "Artificers."

MR. TRAYLEN moved, as a further amendment, that the item be inserted as "Tools and parts thereof," and be placed in alphabetical order.

MR. PIESSE accepted this in lieu of his amendment, which was, by leave, withdrawn.

Remaining amendment put and passed, and the item, as amended, inserted accordingly.

Item—"Bark for Tanning":

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved that the item be struck out, with a view to its insertion in the Sixth Schedule. He said the local wattle bark was not so suitable for tanning as the bark which was used elsewhere, and the imported bark should be admitted free.

MR. PIESSE said the tanning properties of the local bark were 31 per cent. as compared with 34 per cent. of the best South Australian bark. Bark from this colony had been shipped to London, for tanning purposes, and sold there at a price equal to that obtained for South Australian bark.

MR. PEARSE said he had exported bark to England at £11 a ton, the South Australian bark then selling in England at £13.

MR. QUINLAN said it was suggested to him that the item should be altered to "Tanning Materials," so as to embrace various materials used in the tanning industry.

Motion put and negatived, and the item passed.

New Item—"Belting for Machinery":

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, in accordance with His Excellency's Message, that this new item be inserted.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

New Item—"Cardboard for Box-making":

MR. TRAYLEN moved that this new item be inserted.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

New Item—"Copper Wire":

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, in accordance with His Excel-

lency's Message, that this new item be inserted.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

Item—"Hides (green)":

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the item be struck out. He said it had been already inserted in the list of specific duties.

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

New item—"Iron Sulphate":

MR. HARPER moved that this new item be inserted.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

Item—"Lithographic Machinery and Materials, including Stones":

MR. TRAYLEN moved, as an amendment, that the word "Presses" be inserted after the word "Machinery."

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

New Item—"Millboard":

MR. TRAYLEN moved that this new item be inserted.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

Item—"Oil (Cod, in bulk)":

MR. QUINLAN moved that the item be struck out, with a view to inserting it in the free list. He said this article was in the free list before, and as cod-liver oil was used chiefly for consumptive invalids, it ought to be admitted free.

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

Ayes ...	...	...	7
Noes ...	...	...	17

Majority against ...	10
----------------------	----

Ayes.  
Mr. Clarkson  
Mr. DeHamel  
Mr. Monger  
Mr. Paterson  
Mr. E. F. Sholl  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. Quinlan (Teller).

Noes.  
Mr. Connor  
Mr. Cookworthy  
Mr. Darlôt  
Sir John Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Piesse  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. Simpson  
Sir J. G. Lee Steere  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. Traylen (Teller).

Motion negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Pine and other Soft Woods (in balks, rough or hewn)":

MR. PIESSE moved, as an amendment, that the words "tongued, grooved, and beaded" be inserted after the words "Soft Woods."

MR. LOTON said that if local machinery would tongue and groove jarrah wood, it would do soft woods also.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) opposed the amendment, saying that this being a timber country, the local hard woods could be used for many purposes, instead of soft woods being so largely imported. Soft woods should be admitted in balk, and be tongued and grooved within the colony if required. Soft woods were rated in the old schedule at 20 per cent., when machinery had been used on them, whereas the amendment would admit them at 5 per cent., thus operating against local industry.

MR. A. FORREST supported the item, and hoped the local timber interests would be protected.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said it would be better if the hon. member (Mr. A. Forrest), being a millowner, would not advocate his own interest in that House. Imported pine and matchwood were useful timbers, and should come in at a low duty.

MR. RICHARDSON supported the amendment, saying it was in accordance with the Commission's recommendation. Matchboarding was useful where jarrah was unsuitable.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn, and the item passed.

Item—"Paraffine Wax":

MR. SOLOMON moved, as an amendment, that the item be struck out, with a view to its insertion in the free list. He said this article was used largely in soap and candle-making.

MR. PIESSE said the article had been on the free list before, and ought to be admitted free as a material necessary to a local industry.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the article was put in this list on the recommendation of the Commission.

Amendment negatived, and the item passed.

Item—"Saddlers' Furniture and Ironmongery":

MR. RICHARDSON moved, as an amendment, to insert the word "materials" after the word "saddlers'."

Amendment put and passed, and the item amended accordingly.

Item—"Sheathing."

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the item be struck out, with a view to its insertion in another schedule.

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

Item—"Stearine."

MR. SOLOMON moved that the item be struck out, with a view to its insertion in the free list. He said the article was greatly used in the manufacture of candles.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) supported the motion, saying the soap and candle manufactory at Fremantle should be reasonably supported as an industry, by the admission of raw materials free.

MR. SIMPSON supported the motion, saying the local industries should have raw materials admitted free.

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

Item—"Staves and Hoops."

MR. TRAYLEN moved, as an amendment, that the word "Strawboards" be inserted after the word "Staves." He said strawboards were used by bookbinders.

Amendment put and passed, and the item amended accordingly.

New Item—"Telegraph and Telephone Material, including Instruments."

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, in accordance with His Excellency's Message, that this new item be inserted.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

New Item—"Timber in short lengths, for case making."

MR. PIESSÉ moved that this new item be inserted. He said suitable timber for making cases and boxes could not be obtained in the colony, and had to be imported, usually in short lengths, for making up.

MR. TRAYLEN supported the addition of this item.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

New Item—"Woollens, Tweeds, Cottons, and other Textile Piece Goods, Trim-

mings, and Appointments used for the manufacture of Clothing."

MR. SOLOMON moved that this new item be inserted. He said it was necessary that tailors who made up clothing should be able to import the materials cheaply. He had received a memorial from a number of working tailors, asking for this concession.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that motions of this kind showed the unwisdom of appointing a Commission to revise the tariff. It would be better, even now, to reject the Tariff Bill, and allow the Government to bring down a fresh tariff of their own.

MR. MONGER supported the proposal, and said it was in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the committee should be careful in dealing with these big items, because the Government must have a revenue for carrying on the business of the country. Over £20,000 was received, last year, in duties on drapery; and it would be impossible to estimate what effect this amendment, if carried, would have on the revenue. To place these articles in the 10 per cent. list, as the Government proposed, would not make a great difference to the consumers, while the difference to the revenue would be large. These articles had been charged at 12½ per cent. previously, whereas this proposal would reduce the duty to 5 per cent. The Government could not consent to admit these articles at 5 per cent.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that, after the Premier's remarks, he was inclined to support the proposal, because, if carried, it would probably destroy the Bill. The former tariff was far preferable to this one.

MR. LOTON said the hon. member's motion included too many articles. Woollens and tweeds in the piece might be reduced, but to include all sorts of cotton goods would be a wide range.

MR. SOLOMON said he would accept the last suggestion and modify his proposal.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

New Item—"Woollens, Tweeds, and Piece Goods used for the manufacture of Clothing."

MR. SOLOMON moved that this new item be inserted. He hoped that the new

item, in this reduced form, would obtain more support.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the new item, in this form, would still affect the revenue seriously, while its effect on individual users of the articles, when made up as clothing, would be only the difference between 5 and 10 per cent. The Government proposed to give a better margin to the tailors than they had before. When dealing with the tariff, if more revenue could be obtained from particular articles without hurting the consumers, he did not see why the revenue should not be obtained.

MR. LOTON said he was not in favour of the new item in this form, even though he had suggested it. The business of local tailors was in the higher-priced articles, and if the duty on these articles were reduced to 5 per cent., the benefit would go to the persons who were best able to pay, namely, the higher classes, who used tailor-made clothing.

Motion put and negatived.

New Item—"Tanning Materials, Sumac, Myrobollams, Valonia:"

MR. A. FORREST moved that this new item be inserted. He said the materials were used by tanners, and should be admitted at a low duty.

Motion put and passed, and the item inserted accordingly, in alphabetical order.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to, and added to the Bill.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

##### CONCURRENCE IN ABOLITION OF ABORIGINES PROTECTION BOARD.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

"Mr. Speaker,

"In reply to Message No. 20, the Legislative Council informs the Legislative Assembly that it agrees to the Resolutions forwarded therewith, respecting the Abolition of the Aborigines Protection Board.

"GEO. SHENTON,  
"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber,  
"Perth, September 21st, 1893."

##### CONCURRENCE IN BILLS.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

"Mr. Speaker,

"The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to the undermentioned Bills, without amendment:—

"An Act to authorise the Director of Public Works to exercise the Powers of the Council of a Municipality with respect to certain Waterworks within the Municipality of Fremantle."

"An Act to authorise the Raising of a Sum of Five hundred and forty thousand pounds by Loan for the construction of certain Public Works, and other purposes."

"GEO. SHENTON,  
"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber,  
"Perth, September 21st, 1893."

##### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 1:52 o'clock a.m.

#### Legislative Council,

Monday, 25th September, 1893.

Aborigines Protection Board: paper—Land Sales: suggested amendment of Regulations—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 8 o'clock p.m.

##### PRAYERS.

##### ABORIGINES PROTECTION BOARD.

THE HON. G. W. LEAKE laid upon the table certain reports respecting the aborigines, from Mr. C. M. Straker, agent for the Aborigines Protection Board, at the North-West.