

great deal to say with reference to the Act, he thought, in order to economise the time of the House, it would be as well his arguments should be addressed to the Select Committee.

Members having delivered to the Clerk the list of such members to serve on such Committee, the Clerk reported to the Speaker the following names as having the greatest number of votes:—The Honorable A. C. Onslow, Mr. Brown, Mr. Burt, Mr. Crowther, Mr. S. H. Parker, Mr. Marmion, Mr. Randell, and Mr. Steere.

#### STATUTES (ERRORS) AMENDMENT BILL.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow): I think I am right in saying that the consideration of this Bill was postponed in order to afford hon. members time to discover further errors than the Revision Committee were able to discover. I hope, if any have been discovered, they will be forthcoming, and they will instantly find place in the schedule. I do not know that I need say much more in again moving the second reading of the Bill. The Commission has completed its work, and, in order to put their work into print, it is necessary that these clerical errors should be made. Without it, the Commission would be taking upon itself the right of legislating instead of revising, and would be usurping the proper functions of this House. If the Bill is not passed, the Statutes will have to be printed with these errors in them; that is all.

MR. STEERE saw no objection to the Bill being read a second time, so long as its committal was not hurried. As there were other Acts which it was proposed to consolidate during the Session, he thought it would be just as well that the Bill should not be proceeded with beyond its second reading until a later part of the Session.

MR. BURT said there could be no particular hurry for the Bill becoming law, and until the work of the Commission—who, by the bye, call themselves a Revision Committee, though in the first instance they were a Consolidating Committee—was printed, he thought it would be premature to pass this Bill. It did not disclose a great many errors, and on a very cursory perusal of the Statutes he

had found quite as many more. The Government, at any rate, could have no objection to postpone the committal of the Bill.

The motion for the second reading was then agreed to.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (SUPPLEMENTARY), 1882.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) moved the second reading of this Bill without comment.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at half-past ten o'clock, p.m.

---

### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

*Tuesday, 8th August, 1882.*

---

Barristers: Rules for Admission of—Refreshment Room, Perth Railway Station—Expenses of Assistant Superintendent of Roads—Alteration of Telegraph Hours—Balance of Road Loan: How expended—Hawkers Bill: recommitted—Customs Ordinance, 1860, Amendment Bill: second reading—Messages Nos. 1 and 2—Tariff Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### RULES FOR ADMISSION OF BARRISTERS.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow): I rise for the purpose of trespassing on the indulgence of the House while I offer a few words of supplementary explanation with reference to the constitution of the Board for the approval of qualified persons to act as Barristers and Practitioners of the Supreme Court. The Colonial Secretary, in answer to the question put by the hon. member for the Swan (*vide p. 59*

*ante*), inquiring what steps had been taken to form this Board, and as to when it was intended to promulgate the Rules for regulating the admission of Barristers, as required by the second section of the Act (45th Vict. No. 1), said that the Rules had not yet been framed because there had been no immediate or urgent occasion for them. Since that answer was given, it has been brought to my attention that the Chief Justice had moved in the matter some time ago, and it is in explanation of the position of His Honor the Chief Justice with reference to the constitution of this Board that I wish to say a few words. The Act requires that the Board shall consist of the Chief Justice and the Attorney General for the time being, and of one practising Barrister of the Supreme Court, the latter to be annually elected, in the month of December in each year, by the other practitioners of the Court, and, in default of such election, it is competent for the Chief Justice and the Attorney General to appoint a Barrister to act in conjunction with them on the Board. The time within which the practising Barrister should have been elected elapsed without that appointment being made, and within a reasonable time of the lapse of that period the Chief Justice drew His Excellency's attention to the fact that the Board had not been constituted, and suggested that the Attorney General should take steps in the matter. When the matter was mentioned to me I gave it as my humble opinion that it was not for the Attorney General to take the initiative but rather His Honor the Chief Justice, and that it was for the Attorney General to act in conjunction with the Chief Justice. It was then suggested that the Chief Justice should make the appointment, in conjunction with the Attorney General; but, somehow or other, it was not done. It is not fair, however, to suggest that the Chief Justice did not take any action in the matter, and the fact of the Board not having been constituted was simply the result of a misunderstanding: the Chief Justice thought the Attorney General should have taken the initiative, and the Attorney General thought the Chief Justice should do so, and that is why the Board was not constituted in due time.

#### REFRESHMENT ROOM, PERTH RAILWAY STATION.

MR. S. H. PARKER, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Secretary, "Whether the Government intend after the present year to continue to let a room at the City Railway Station as a "Drinking Saloon?" The hon. member said he thought it must be obvious to all persons who had access to the railway station, and to the travelling public, that the so-called refreshment room was degenerating into a mere drinking bar, and he trusted he had only to draw the attention of the Government to the matter to ensure steps being taken to remedy this state of things.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) in reply, said—"At present it is the intention of the Government to continue the Refreshment Room, but greater restrictions will be imposed with regard to selling drink to other than *bonâ fide* passengers. I beg to refer the honorable member to His Excellency's minute on this subject, attached to the Report of the Acting Commissioner of "Railways (Sessional Paper No. 18)."

#### EXPENSES OF SUPERINTENDENT OF ROADS.

MR. CAREY, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Secretary, "For a return showing all expenses incurred by and for the Assistant Superintendent of Roads in salary, allowances, and expenses (fares, &c.), from date of employment to 30th June "last." The hon. member said he asked for this supplementary return, in addition to that furnished yesterday, relating to the Superintendent of Roads, in order that the House may ascertain how much it has cost the country for the destruction—he would not say construction—of our roads, in connection with the Road Loan.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) said that the salary paid to the Assistant Superintendent up to 30th June last was £372, and that the travelling allowances of the same officer, up to the same date, amounted to £53 0s. 9d.

#### TELEGRAPH OFFICE HOURS.

MR. BURT, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Secretary, "What

"arrangements, if any, have been made for an alteration of the Telegraph hours, in pursuance of the noble lord's statement to the House on the 31st August, 1881?" The hon. member said attention had been called to the desirability of altering the office hours in the Telegraph Department on several occasions in that House, and last year they had the assurance of the noble lord that the Government would deal with the matter; but, up to the present time, no steps whatever had been taken to bring about the desired change. He believed there was a strong feeling in commercial circles in favor of keeping the Telegraph Office open all day, without intermission.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) replied:—"No arrangements have been made for altering the Telegraph hours, inasmuch as His Excellency, after fully considering the question and inviting the views of the leading men of business in the place, came to the conclusion that the majority of the public are in favor of retaining the present office hours, as being more conducive to the general convenience than the hours proposed. The present hours are also more useful so far as the Government is concerned."

#### BALANCE OF ROAD LOAN: HOW TO BE EXPENDED.

On the motion of Mr. BURT, THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) laid on the Table of the House a Return showing:—"1. Upon what works the Government intends to expend the balance of the Roads Loan now in hand. 2. Also showing what sum out of the loan has been expended in the Murray District to date (exclusive of salary, travelling expenses, and allowances to officers of the Government in connection with such expenditure)."

#### HAWKERS BILL.

On the Order of the Day for the third reading of this Bill being read,

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) moved, That the Order be discharged and the Bill be recommitted, in order to introduce an amendment in the 6th clause, with reference to the dates and places for issuing licenses under the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 6 read:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) moved, That all the words from the commencement of the clause, down to the word "licenses," in the 6th line, be struck out, and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof:—"It shall be lawful for the Justices of the Peace, assembled in general meeting, upon the first Monday in the months of September, December, March, and June in each year, at each of the places hereinafter mentioned, to take into consideration applications for hawkers and pedlars licenses."

Motion agreed to.

MR. RANDELL said he was desirous of introducing a new clause, excluding the colportage of books from the operation of the Bill. He did so in the interest of the dissemination of pure and wholesome literature throughout the Colony. Doubts had arisen as to whether persons engaged in the sale of books, magazines, and other periodicals would be required to take out a hawker's license under this Bill, and he thought all would agree with him that it would be very undesirable that any impediment should be thrown in the way of persons undertaking so useful a work as the dissemination of wholesome literature. His object was simply to place books on the same footing as newspapers.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) thought the object which the hon. member had at heart would commend itself to the minds of the whole Committee, but it appeared to him that the hon. member might effect what he proposed doing in a much more simple manner than by introducing a new clause into the Bill, namely, by the addition of the word "books" to the proviso in the 3rd clause, excluding fish, fruit, water, milk, and other things from the operation of the Act. There was no necessity for a special section concerning books any more than any other wares which were allowed to be hawked about without a license.

MR. RANDELL said he was quite prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Bill reported as amended.

CUSTOMS ORDINANCE, 1860, AMENDMENT BILL.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it was introduced with a view to remove certain doubts which had been raised respecting the collection of Customs duties on goods liable to such duties brought into the Colony overland. The right hon. gentleman said that settlement in South Australia was spreading rapidly in the direction of the border line between that Colony and our own settlement; and spirits and other dutiable articles had been introduced into this Colony across the border. There being some doubt as to whether the existing Customs Ordinance empowered us to deal with such cases, the present Bill was introduced to remove such doubts. The duties leviable under it would be precisely the same as under the existing Ordinance.

The Bill was read a second time without discussion.

MESSAGE (No. 1): MR. FAIRBAIRN'S REPORTS.

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

"In reply to the Address from Your Honorable House No. 2, of the 31st ultimo, the Governor now forwards, for the information and consideration of members, copies of the Reports received from the Resident Magistrate despatched by direction of the Governor on special duty to the Murchison and Gascoyne Districts.

"Government House, Perth, 8th August, 1882."

MESSAGE (No. 2): MINUTES OF CENTRAL ROAD COMMITTEE.

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

"In reply to the Address of Your Honorable Council No. 3, of the 2nd August, the Governor begs to state that he will be happy to furnish the House with information on any point connected with the business of the Central Roads Committee which may be desired by the Council, but that the minutes of the meetings of the Committee are not documents of a character

"which could conveniently be communicated to the Legislature.

"Government House, Perth, 8th August, 1882."

TARIFF BILL.

The House then went into Committee on the Tariff Bill.

The various clauses of the Bill were agreed to without discussion, and it was intimated that it was proposed to bring the Act into operation on the 7th October next.

MR. S. H. PARKER moved a new clause restricting the operation of the Bill to a period of three years from the date of its coming into force. His object in moving it was simply this,—he thought it was unwise to give the Government power to tax the country for ever, without further reference to the Legislature. He was not aware that it was contrary to constitutional practice to limit the operation of Acts of this kind for a particular period. It would be very easy for the Government at the expiration of that time to come to the House, and he had been very pleased the other evening to hear from the noble lord opposite that the Government would be prepared to accept a clause to this effect.

MR. SHENTON hardly saw the necessity of such a clause being introduced into the Bill. Possibly the House might see its way clear, before the three years expired, to alter the tariff again, or there might be an absolute necessity for doing so, perhaps twelve months hence. For this reason, he felt disposed to object to the introduction of a clause making the Bill operative for a period of three years, and would prefer letting it run on until such time as it may be found expedient to alter the tariff again.

MR. S. H. PARKER: Surely the hon. member does not think that, if we restrict the operation of the Bill to a period of three years, we need necessarily keep it in force all that time. There is nothing to prevent our repealing it, at the very next Session, if the House thinks fit. My object is simply to prevent the Bill being allowed to remain in force, without reference to this House, for a longer period than three years.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow) said he quite agreed with

the hon. member for Toodyay, as to the inutility of the proposed clause. It would add nothing to the powers of the House, and, if omitted, it would in no way take away from the powers of the House. It was quite competent for the Legislature to repeal this Bill at any time.

**MR. S. H. PARKER:** We cannot repeal it without the assent of the Governor; but if we put this clause in the present Bill, it will expire by effluxion of time, and the Government must come to this House to give it a fresh lease of existence, or to get another tariff passed.

**MR. MARMION** thought, if things came to such a pass that the Governor were to refuse his assent to a Tariff Bill passed by that House, the House would not find much difficulty in determining its course of action, under such circumstances. Whenever the members of the Legislature wished to make an alteration in the tariff, it would be competent for them to move an Humble Address to the Governor, and, if that were done, he did not anticipate any opposition would be shown to the wishes of the Legislature.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY** (Lord Gifford) said he was so astonished and so gratified the other evening to find the hon. member for Perth so enamoured of a Government measure as to express a wish the Bill should remain in force for a period of three years, that he (the Colonial Secretary) accepted the suggestion, on the spur of the moment. Nor did he know that he was going to oppose it now, although he must say he failed to see any necessity for it. If the House were to come forward next year, in the event of this Bill not working satisfactorily, and to pass another Tariff Bill, it could not be supposed for a moment that the Government would not listen to the representations of the Legislature on such a subject; and, if it should be considered necessary to repeal the Act, the Government would be ready to co-operate with the Council and have it repealed. He failed to see that the clause was likely to do much good or much harm.

**MR. STEERE** did not think it would be advisable, for reasons he had mentioned the other evening, to add a clause to the Bill restricting its operation for a period of three years. The result must be to unsettle people's minds, and to hamper

commercial transactions, without any compensating advantages that he could see. The object of the hon. member for Perth appeared to be to give the Legislature greater power over the Government as regards the fiscal resources of the Colony, and no doubt the Bill, with this clause in it, would to a certain extent place the Government at the mercy of the House, for unless the House, at the expiration of the three years, was prepared to re-enact the Bill, the Administration of the day would be without any fiscal revenue at all. He believed it was the practice in the House of Commons to levy an annual tax upon tea, in order that Parliament may in that way retain a certain amount of power over the Government; and, if the hon. member for Perth chose to follow the precedent of the House of Commons, and pick out some particular item of revenue in the schedule of the Bill, and make it the subject of an annual tax, he should be very much inclined to go with the hon. member; but not to limit the operation of the Act altogether to any given period.

**MR. CROWTHER** thought it would be unwise to restrict the existence of the Act to any particular time, as such restriction only tended to restrict the operations of commercial people. The power remained in the hands of the House to alter the Bill when it thought fit or necessary to do so.

The proposal to introduce the new clause was then put, and negatived, on the voices.

**FIRST SCHEDULE: Specific Duties—**  
Bacon, hams, and tongue, 3d. per lb.; beer, cider, and perry, 1s. per gallon; blasting powder,  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb.; bran and pollard, 10s. per ton; butter, 2d. per lb.; candles, 1d. per lb.; cement, 2s. per barrel; cheese, 3d. per lb.; cigars and snuff, 5s. per lb.; cocoa, chocolate, chicory, or coffee (roast or ground), 3d. per lb.; coffee (raw), 2d. per lb.; confectionery, 4d.

These items were agreed to without discussion.

Corn, including oats, wheat, barley, and maize, 4d. per bushel:

**MR. S. H. PARKER** said he had already expressed his opinion with reference to the desirability of placing corn and flour on the free list; and, in order to be consistent with his professions, he begged

to move, as an amendment, that the item of wheat be struck out of this schedule, and admitted free of duty. If it is desirable that flour should be admitted into the Colony duty free, *a fortiori* wheat ought to be so admitted, as a tax on wheat was a tax on the miller's industry.

MR. MARMION pointed out that the duty proposed to be placed on wheat (4d. a bushel) was a slight reduction on that now charged under the *ad valorem* rate of ten per cent., which, at prices ordinarily ruling, would amount to about 6d. a bushel, and at the present market rate for wheat would be about 8d. Although he would not have, of his own mere motion, taken any steps in the matter of placing this article and flour on the free list, still, as the hon. member for Perth had moved an amendment to that effect, he felt bound to support it, as the proposal was consistent with the views he had always advocated on the subject. There were many good reasons why these articles should be placed on the free list, but he need not now refer to them, as they had over and over again been dilated upon in that House.

MR. BURT said, if the Committee divided on this item, he should follow the hon. member for Perth and the hon. member for Fremantle. The Committee must recollect perfectly well that the first occasion on which a tax was placed on corn and flour was three years ago, and it was then introduced by the Government of the day on the particular ground that there was a large deficit which required to be wiped out. It was distinctly stated at the time that, but for this deficit, the duty on breadstuffs would not have been imposed; and, now, as the deficit had been wiped off, and there was a handsome balance to credit, he thought the tax ought to be removed. There appeared to be a growing tendency in the House to adopt what was called the principle of protection, and if those who were opposed to that principle did not make a stand, we should soon have such a tariff as that of Victoria, the fallacy of which had been demonstrated by the experience of that colony. As to the cry of protecting local industries, which was one of the excuses put forward by the Commission for retaining these duties, the only industry they protected was that of wheat-growing, and the amount of protection which the

duty afforded to that industry was shown by the fact that of late we had actually grown less wheat than ever. He was not going to raise any argument upon the vexed question of free trade *v.* protection, which was a question that very few understood; but he would say this, if we cannot afford to have a free trade tariff altogether, there was one article at any rate which above all others we ought to admit duty free, namely, that of breadstuffs. With a view, therefore, to stem the current of opinion which seemed to be setting in in favor of protection—in favor of protecting native industries which had no existence—he should support the amendment, and he hoped the Committee would divide upon it.

MR. VENN would in no way support the amendment. The hon. member for Murray and Williams said the question of free trade *v.* protection was very little understood in this Colony; but he would inform the hon. member there was one thing which our farmers thoroughly understood, and that was the very low price which they obtained for their produce. This duty, small as it was, would afford some encouragement to them. As to free trade, pure and simple, he did not think there was such a thing in existence,—at any rate in this Colony, where we find the upholders of free trade principles calling upon the producer to tax himself in order to subsidize steamers to bring in produce from other colonies to compete in the local market against his own.

MR. CROWTHER said the favorite argument in favor of abolishing the duty on breadstuffs was, that it was a tax upon one of the necessaries of life. No doubt bread was a necessary of civilised life, and so also was a suit of clothes,—perhaps even more so, from one point of view, than a loaf of bread. The majesty of the law would not be outraged if a man did not satisfy his hunger with a quarter loaf, but the police would very soon “fix” him if he appeared in public after the fashion of our first parents, or the fashion still prevailing among our colored friends, the native gentry. It appeared to him the merest bunkum to talk of the question of free trade or protection as forming an element in the consideration of the tariff of this Colony, which was simply based

upon the necessity of raising a certain amount of revenue; and it was upon that ground that he supported this duty, and should vote against the amendment. As to the "poor man's" loaf, the poor man in this Colony was the struggling farmer who produced the corn to make that loaf, and had to run the chance of ever being paid for it; and not the so-called poor man who received his 30s. or £2 a week, every Saturday night.

MR. CAREY would support the amendment. If it was asked what other source of revenue could be substituted in lieu of the duty on breadstuffs, he should say an export duty on wool. Even a farthing a pound would yield between £4000 and £5000 from that source, which was a great deal more than we would ever get from flour. Pearl shells, too, would be another legitimate source of additional revenue.

MR. MARMION said the total amount of duty received from imported wheat last year was £43, and flour £1300.

MR. STEERE said they were told the other evening in the House that the members of the Tariff Commission had made up their minds to vote with one accord upon this Bill, but it would be now seen that one member of that Commission at any rate (the hon. member for Fremantle) intended voting against the recommendations of that Committee as regards this item, which was conclusive proof that the members of the Commission were in no way pledged as to their subsequent action in that House. The hon. member for Murray argued that this was only a small item, and that its loss would not be much felt; but he would remind the Committee that the whole of our tariff was made up of an aggregation of small items; and, if this was such a very trifling item, the fact of its being so cut both ways, for, being so small, it could not be said to press very heavily upon the so-called "poor man." It appeared to him the item was so very small indeed, that it was not likely to oppress the poor man in any way.

MR. BURT: If the item is so small, and so insignificant, how is it likely to afford any protection to our farmers, which is the only ground urged in its favor? It is simply absurd to support such a tax on the ground of protecting the agricultural industry. No farmer in

the Colony can regard £1 a ton as a protective tax upon flour.

MR. BROWN said, as he was a member of the Commission that framed this tariff, he did not like to give a silent vote. To get a duty placed upon flour had been one of the objects of his life, and after many years of labor in that House he had at last succeeded in contributing towards the successful attainment of that object, so that it could not be said that, in voting that evening in support of this "imposition"—as the hon. member for the North was pleased to term it—he was doing so simply because the Commission had recommended it. What he meant to say was this—so long as they represented Western Australia to be an agricultural country, and sought to encourage people to devote their attention to the production of flour, and, on the other hand, exacted from them taxes for carrying on the Government of the Colony, it would be an injustice to the *bonâ fide* agriculturist to allow those who are not producers, but hangers-on, to import foreign flour into the local market, duty free, to compete against the produce of these taxpayers. So far as the question of free trade or protection went, that question did not enter as an element into the consideration of this tariff in any sense, and he advocated this duty as a simple act of justice to the agriculturists and taxpayers of the Colony.

Question—That the item proposed to be struck out stand part of the schedule—put.

Committee divided.

Ayes	...	...	13
Noes	...	...	7
Majority against ...			6

AYES.  
The Hon. A. C. Onslow  
The Hon. M. Fraser  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. Burges  
Mr. Crowther  
Mr. Glyde  
Mr. Hamersley  
Mr. S. S. Parker  
Mr. Randell  
Mr. Shenton  
Mr. Steere  
Mr. Venn  
Lord Gifford (Teller.)

NOES.  
Mr. Burt  
Mr. Carey  
Mr. Grant  
Mr. Higham  
Sir L. S. Leake, Kt.  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. S. H. Parker (Teller.)

The motion was therefore negatived.

MR. S. H. PARKER moved, That item "Flour £1" be struck out.

Question—put and negatived, on the voices.

Fruit, Dried, 3d. per lb. :

MR. MARMION hoped the Committee would agree to insert the words "not including dates." He did so for the sake of the little children. It had been his intention to have moved to reduce the duty on dried fruits from 3d. to 2d., but as the Committee did not seem in the humour for reductions, he felt somewhat disheartened, and refrained from doing so. The proposed reduction would make a difference of about £700 in the revenue. It could not be said that the duty had in any way tended to stimulate local industry, for, although it had been in force for years, it had not yet had the effect of encouraging the production of dried fruits in any way, so far as supplying our local requirements went.

MR. RANDELL said he would have been prepared to support the proposal to reduce this duty, if the hon. member for Fremantle had persevered in his intention of moving it. He thought there was room for a very strong opinion on the subject, for the duty in some instances amounted to nearly 100 per cent. of the cost value of the imported article.

MR. STEERE said the reason why the Tariff Commission had fixed upon this scale of duty was precisely the same reason as that which had induced them to adjust the whole of the tariff on the proposed basis, namely, the absolute necessity imposed upon them, according to their instructions, to provide for a certain amount of revenue from the Customs; and if the duty were to be reduced, as suggested by the hon. member for Fremantle, there would be a clear loss to the revenue of £700 or £800.

MR. SHENTON said he had suggested to the Commission that an extra duty of 6d. a gallon on spirits should be substituted in lieu of the proposed reduction in the duty on dried fruit, but the Commission did not accept his suggestion.

MR. MARMION pointed out that whatever may have been the instructions given to the Commission, such instructions were not binding upon a Committee of that House. It was for the House to provide such ways and means as it might deem desirable and for the Government to frame their expenditure accordingly.

In order to test the feeling of the Committee he would formally move that the duty on dried fruit be reduced from 3d. to 2d.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) believed it would be admitted that every effort had been made by the Government to adjust the incidence of taxation as equitably as possible, without unduly favoring any class of the community: and, if that House proposed to pursue, as he believed it intended to pursue, a policy of progression, of public works, and public loans, one thing was very certain—it would have to provide the necessary ways and means to enable the Government to give practical effect to such a policy. The Government were already, he might almost say, pledged to reduce the duties under the Stamp Act, and if the Committee thought fit to make a further reduction by lowering the Customs duties, it would have to make some other provision in lieu thereof.

MR. GLYDE, while agreeing with the hon. member for Fremantle that the duty on dried fruit was excessively high, still, seeing that they were assured by the noble lord the leader of the Government that a certain amount of revenue was absolutely necessary to enable them to provide for the proposed additional loan, and other charges entailed by the public works policy which the Colony had entered upon, he felt bound to oppose the suggested reduction.

The proposal to reduce the duty on dried fruit was then put and negatived, on the voices. The item was accordingly passed as printed.

Galvanized iron, £2 per ton; ginger, 3d. per lb.; gunny, bran, and ore bags, 6d. per doz. :

Agreed to without objection.

Hay and chaff, 12s. 6d. per ton :

MR. CAREY moved to increase this duty to 20s. per ton,—a proposition which he was sure the Government, in its anxiety to obtain sufficient revenue, would readily accept. Vessels arriving at the Vasse from the other colonies swamped the market with hay, and he thought the local farmers ought to be protected, to this extent at any rate.

MR. MARMION said that at present hay and chaff were on the *ad valorem* schedule, and the Commission considered that the proposed specific duty of 12s.



6d. would be about equivalent to the present *ad valorem* rate.

The motion to increase the duty was negatived, and the item agreed to as originally proposed.

Hops, 4d. per lb.; iron wire for fencing, standards, etc., 1s. per cwt.; iron (hoop), 1s. per cwt.; iron gates, hurdles, and staples, and bars for fencing, 1s. per cwt.; lead (sheet, pig, and piping), 2s. 6d. per cwt.; malt, 2s. per bushel:

Agreed to *sub silentio*.

Oatmeal, £1 10s. per ton:

MR. CAREY said he did not suppose we produced a ton of oatmeal in the whole Colony, and as this was an article largely consumed, he thought the Committee would agree with him that it would be desirable to reduce the duty from 30s. to 10s.

MR. MARMION pointed out that the proposed duty was simply equivalent to the existing duty (10 per cent.) chargeable under the *ad valorem* scale,—that was to say, taking £15 per ton as the ordinary averagemarket value of oatmeal. At present he believed it was something like £25 per ton.

The amendment submitted by the hon. member for the Vasse was negatived, and the item agreed to.

Oil (fish and vegetable, except salad in bottles), 6d. per gallon; oils (mineral and turpentine), 6d.; onions, 10s. per ton; pepper, 3d. per lb.:

Agreed to without discussion.

Potatoes, 10s. per ton:

MR. CAREY thought it would be generally admitted that the district which he had the honor to represent produced most excellent potatoes, and, if the growers had a little more encouragement, there would be no dearth of Vasse potatoes in the market. In order to bring about that desirable state of things, he would move that this duty be increased to 30s. per ton.

MR. CROWTHER said the Vasse might be capable of producing "most excellent potatoes," but they could never be obtained. If you sent for ten tons, the probability was you would get ten cwts. The cry of the Vassites was either there was a splendid crop coming up, or, they had just had a splendid crop, and it was all gone.

The motion to increase the duty was rejected, and the item put and passed.

Rice, 2s. per cwt.; sacks (corn and flour) 1s. per dozen; sago, 1d. per lb.; salt (except rock), £1 per ton; soap (not toilet), 2s. 6d. per cwt.; shot, 5s. per cwt.; soda (crystal), £2 per ton; spices, 3d. per lb.; spirits, cordials, or strong waters, 15s. per gallon; spirits of wine (rectified), £1 per gallon; sporting powder, 4d. per lb.; sugar, molasses, and treacle, 4s. per cwt.; tea, 4d. per lb.; tobacco (manufactured), 3s. per lb.; tobacco (unmanufactured), 1s. per lb.; tobacco, for sheep-wash, 3d. per lb.; vinegar, 6d. per gallon; wine (sparkling), 6s. per gallon; wine (except sparkling), 4s. per gallon; woolbales, 4d.

These items were all agreed to without opposition, and the schedule of specific duties adopted.

SECOND SCHEDULE: *Ten per cent. ad valorem.*

Agreed to, without discussion.

THIRD SCHEDULE: *Five per cent. ad valorem.*

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) moved, That after the item "Patent material for wool scouring," the item "Printing Presses and Type" be inserted.

MR. CROWTHER, referring to the item "Patent material for wool scouring" said it appeared somewhat strange, not to say anomalous, that material which we could do well enough without should only be charged 5 per cent., when sulphur, which was indispensable to our sheep owners, should be charged 10 per cent.

The motion to insert "Printing Presses and Type" was then agreed to.

MR. CROWTHER, referring to the item "Smelting Material," said that in the proposition made by the Government and Messrs. Schaw & Co., with regard to the erection of smelting works, one of the inducements offered to the company was that all smelting material which they required should be admitted duty free. Would the fact of this item being placed on the 5 per cent. list affect that proposal?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Lord Gifford) said the duty would have to be refunded.

The item was agreed to, as also the remaining items in the schedule.

FOURTH SCHEDULE: *Twelve and a-half per cent. ad valorem.*

Agreed to without discussion.

FIFTH SCHEDULE: *Goods free of duty.*  
Agreed to without discussion.

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

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Wednesday, 9th August, 1882.

Scab Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Jury Act, 1871, Amendment Bill: second reading—Imported Labor Registry Bill: second reading—Masters and Servants Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Hawkers Bill: recommitted—Customs Ordinance, 1860, Amendment Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

### SCAB ACT AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

MR. STEERE, in moving the second reading of a Bill to amend and consolidate the laws for preventing and exterminating scab in sheep, said the Bill was mainly introduced for the purpose of consolidating existing Ordinances, rather than for amending the principal Act; but it also sought to alter a few clauses of that Act, which at present were more or less ambiguous. The 7th clause of the Amendment Act passed last year required immediate notice of infection to be given to the inspector and also to the Colonial Secretary, but, owing in some cases to the long distances which notices had to be forwarded to the Colonial Secretary, it was considered by the Board of Advice that it would be more convenient if the notices of infection were sent to the inspector and the nearest Resident Magistrate (as originally provided in the principal Act). The next amendment and the most important one was that provided in clause 14 of the Bill. It had been held by legal authorities that under the present law an inspector had no right, during the continuance of a

compulsory license, to enter upon a man's run and take such steps as he may think proper to endeavor to clean a neglected flock, but the present Bill removed all doubt on that point, and rendered it lawful for the inspector "at any time" during the continuance of the license to step in and compel the owner to take necessary measures for the cleaning of his sheep, or to cancel his license. The next amendment would be found in the 18th clause of the Bill (dealing with clause 16 of the present Act). It had been found that, although provision was made for punishing a man who allowed sheep which were not infected to be admitted within the quarantine boundary, no provision was made to secure a conviction for permitting the sheep to remain within such boundary. The only other amendment was one made in clause 22 of the present Act, which provided that no owner of sheep, without a written permission to do so from an inspector, shall drive any sheep upon or across another man's run without having first given the owner of such run notice of his intention to do so. But, as a rule, the owners of sheep did not drive them in person, and no provision was made to punish the owner who directed another person to commit a breach of the Act in this respect. The 24th clause of the present Bill remedied that defect, and rendered the owner liable if he shall cause or permit his sheep to be driven upon another man's run without giving him due notice. These were the only amendments provided for in the Bill, which otherwise was merely a consolidation of existing Ordinances.

Motion for second reading agreed to *sub silentio*.

Bill read a second time.

### JURY ACT, 1871, AMENDMENT BILL.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. C. Onslow), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said: I dare say hon. members will feel some annoyance at this constant appearance of small Acts amending other Acts, but, if they will exercise a little patience, they will find that they are unavoidable. By the Supreme Court Act, of 1880, His Excellency the Governor has power to appoint a Commission for the trial of cases, within the