

"any person or persons duly authorised," he need hardly say it was not likely that the Turf Club itself would work the machine, but would let it to others, or have servants of their own authorised by them to work it. That was all that was meant by these words, and he saw nothing in the clause which would render it difficult of being construed by any Court.

The clause was then put and passed.

Clause 2—Short Title:

Agreed to.

Preamble and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported.

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

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

*Tuesday, 29th August, 1893.*

Inland Mail Service in the Gascoyne District—Concessions, as to pre-emptive rights, to Kimberley Lessees: adjourned debate—Dog Bill: further considered in committee—Consideration of Message No. 22: (Roads and Bridges)—Reply to Message No. 26: (Increases of Salaries to Public Officers)—Land Grant Railway Schemes: adjourned debate—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at noon.

PRAYERS.

### INLAND MAIL SERVICE IN THE GASCOYNE DISTRICT.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BROWN moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor praying that he will be pleased to increase to £300 the amount of £150 placed on the Estimates for inland mail services from Carnarvon, in the Gascoyne District. The hon. member said it would be within the knowledge of the committee that a sum of £2,500 had already been agreed upon for a mail

service between Champion Bay and Cossack, and hon. members might be under the impression that the Gascoyne, which was situated between those points, would be served to a large extent by that service, which was calculated to cost so large a sum as £2,500. If hon. members did think so, they would be under a misapprehension. That service would be of little or no use to the Gascoyne settlers, as it would pass a long distance, from 130 to 200 miles, inland, and form no connection whatever with the port of Carnarvon, so as to connect with the steam coastal service. The service he proposed, and for which he asked this extra vote, would start from Carnarvon, the centre of trade, up the Gascoyne to the junction of the Lyons and a little beyond, whereby every settler in the Gascoyne District would be served. He thought the sum asked for would be sufficient to pay for a monthly service, —in fact, he was satisfied it could be done for that. He had been informed it could be done for less, but he did not think so himself.

MR. GRANT thought the proposed inland service a very desirable one, and much preferable to the service for which the House had agreed to pay £2,500, along a route where there was no population hardly at the present time, and which, for his own part, he was altogether averse to.

MR. SHENTON thought hon. members would now see that the revenue would not stand so much strain for the purpose of affording increased postal facilities; he had expressed his doubts on the subject when the £2,500 was asked for by the hon. member for Geraldton, for a service to Cossack. He still thought that was a mistake, especially in view of the proposed subsidy for an ocean steam service to Singapore, via our northern ports, which would give increased postal facilities to the Gascoyne. Other parts of the colony, having a much larger population than the Gascoyne, had only one mail monthly—Dandaragan, for instance, where there were 250 *bonâ fide* settlers, whose mail service only cost the Government about £50 a year. If all these additional votes were going to be granted for inland mails, it must have the effect of paralysing the hands of the Government as regards extending

our steam service, in the direction of Singapore—a matter of paramount importance to our northern settlements.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) would not oppose the motion, and if this would be the total amount required for the inland mail service perhaps there would be no objection to it. He should ask the Postmaster General whether he could not remodel his estimates for mail services in the interior.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest) considered there were other portions of the colony equal deserving of attention, as regards mail communication, as the Gascoyne. His opinion as to the overland mail coach service from Geraldton to Cossack was that it might be very good in theory, but as to people going to have a look at the country in a four-wheeled mail coach he did not think that was very likely. People who went to look at new country were people used to bush travelling, who would prefer going on horseback, and taking their own time about it. This mail coach would have to travel night as well as day, and those who went by it would not have an opportunity of seeing much of the country.

MR. CAREY said, so far from the service from Geraldton to Cossack only costing £2,500, he thought he should be able to show when the estimates came to be considered that it would cost about £20,000, and he was surprised to think that any hon. member should give it a moment's thought. The present resolution, however, was a very modest one, and, regard being had to the number of settlers which it would serve, he thought there should be no hesitation on the part of the House in agreeing to it.

MR. WITTENOOM expressed his surprise at what had fallen from hon. members with reference to the overland service from Geraldton. He thought the proper time to have objected to that proposal was when the resolution was under discussion, and before it was affirmed. It was agreed to without a single dissentient voice, and it did seem to him a most extraordinary thing for members to run it down now. The hon. member for the Vasse said the service would cost £20,000—what had that to do with us? That was a matter for the consideration of the contractor. The

House had only voted £2,500 for the service, and it was for the Government to see that the vote was not exceeded.

MR. CAREY doubted very much whether the service now under consideration could be carried out for £300, and he should like to see the amount increased to £400. He was informed it would cover about 400 miles, and he did not think £400 would be at all too much.

MR. STEERE said he would be quite prepared to support the resolution. The proposed service might be said to embrace a whole district, and would serve every settler in the district, and if it could be carried out for the amount named, it would be a very cheap service.

MR. MARMION said, if the hon. member who brought forward the resolution considered £300 a sufficient sum to carry out the service, he failed to see why the House should vote another £100. It appeared to him they did not get as much from the police, as regards the conveyance of letters, in these outlying districts, as they ought to. He thought it would be very little inconvenience for mounted police to carry a few letters about for the settlers in the bush, and he commended this suggestion to the consideration of the Government.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) thought the service might be carried out for the sum asked for by the member for the district (£300), and the hon. member would do well to adhere to his own proposal.

MR. BROWN said he was quite content to do so, if he had the assurance of the Government that the service would not be abandoned if it should be found that it cost a little over £300.

The resolution was then put and carried.

#### CONCESSIONS TO KIMBERLEY LESSEES: PRE-EMPTIVE RIGHTS.

##### ADJOURNED DEBATE.

MR. BROWN moved for leave to withdraw the amendment proposed by him on the 20th of August, which proposed to give lessees the right to purchase five per cent. of their leases at the upset price of 10s. an acre, subject to certain conditions.

Leave given, and amendment withdrawn.

MR. BURT now moved the following amendment, which he thought expressed the general opinion of the House as indicated in the course of the previous debates on the subject: "That, in the opinion of this House, every lessee in the Kimberley district shall be allowed, in respect of each lease held by him in that district, a pre-emptive right, during the term of each lease, at the rate of 10s. per acre, over any lands comprised in such lease, not exceeding five per cent. of the whole."

MR. RANDELL thought it very desirable the House should have further time to consider this amendment, before proceeding to discuss it. He certainly did not profess to be able to understand it himself, merely on hearing it read, but it appeared to him to proceed in a direction which would have the result of entirely locking up the lands in the district, from all outside purchasers. He decidedly, on the first flush of the subject, was opposed to anything of the kind. He should be rather inclined to fall in with the views already expressed by the hon. member for Greenough and, he believed, by the Commissioner of Crown Lands, who spoke the other day against allowing these lessees to purchase portions of their land out of their runs on any terms, but, as an inducement to improvements being undertaken, that they should have ample security of tenure. The present proposals would have the effect of perpetuating that system of selection which in other districts had proved most detrimental to the interests of the colony, a system under which the tenants of the Crown were enabled to select small portions, but the most important and valuable portions of their runs, for purchase: he said small but the most important because these portions had been described as the "eyes" of the land. He thought, having seen the mischief which had arisen in the past from the system, we ought to be careful not to perpetuate it in other districts of the colony, which was what these proposals aimed at,—especially in view of the fact that there was no limitation or restriction as to where the land was to be selected, whether on all or any of a man's leases. In fact, if this principle were affirmed, these lessees would secure to a very large

extent the freehold of their runs, and by this means would have the entire control of the land in their own hands. He hoped that progress would be reported, in order to allow members an opportunity of considering the full effects of the amendment.

MR. SHENTON said he was opposed to the amendment, for, in its result, it would virtually lock up the land in the district for fourteen years. He had no objection to give the lessees certain pre-emptive rights of selection, but it would be on this condition,—that when these rights were challenged, unless the lessee was prepared to exercise them, they should be cancelled in favor of the applicant who had challenged the right to purchase. They were aware of the injurious effect in the Champion Bay district, in former days, of the same system as was now proposed to be introduced in the Kimberley district,—a system which had produced disastrous results, so far as locking up the lands of the district went.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said he had not yet spoken on this subject, but he did not think it would be right on his part to let it go forth without expressing his views upon it. In his opinion the Government and the Legislature had met the pastoral leaseholders of the Kimberley district in a most liberal spirit, and if the recommendations of the select committee to which the subject of a modification of the stocking clause had been referred this session were agreed to and became law, he might say that these lessees will have had more concessions granted to them than they had any reason to expect when they took up their lands,—without giving them any further concessions, as now proposed. What would be the effect of the proposals now before the House, if the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Murray and Williams became a regulation? It would simply have this effect,—it would enable the lessees in that district to select one-twentieth of the whole of their runs, and thus to absorb the best portions of the Kimberley District,—that was to say, all the land having a frontage to the rivers and watercourses. He believed every member professedly desired to encourage the proper settlement of this district, and at the same time to restrain

idle speculation,—that was to say, speculation not likely to lead to good results; but he could not help imagining that, if this proposal became law, it would have a most disastrous effect upon the future progress of the district. For his own part, he was averse to the granting of any additional privileges to the Kimberley runholders beyond what they had already obtained. They went to the district with their eyes open, and took up their runs well knowing what the conditions were under which they obtained their leases. Why, then, he should like to know, should that Council be asked, inch by inch, yard by yard—and by-and-bye it would be mile by mile—to yield one concession, then another, to people who really did not ask for it? The hon. members who brought forward these well-meaning proposals had no doubt, according to their lights, some good reason for doing so, but, for his own part, he could not see any reason in them at all. He was not in a position to say that the Government would object to some such a modification as this—that, with a view to enable the lessees to secure homesteads for themselves, they should be allowed to select, at the upset price, say five hundred or a thousand acres within their leases for that purpose, and a regulation might be framed under which the lessee might have a pre-emptive right to two acres for every one he purchased. Beyond that he should not be inclined to go, and if this matter were pressed he should divide the House on the subject, for the proposal he knew was one which would not have any practical result. It was all very well for hon. members to come there and say we will scatter away these lands of the colony in a part of our territory which we trust will bring us into greater prominence; but he would ask the House to pause in what it was doing. Why should that Legislature, in the fulness of its liberality, seek to give lessees rights to which they made no claim, and rights which, if approved by the House, would not, he believed, be granted to them. He would ask hon. members to hesitate before recording their votes in favor of proposals which never could be given effect to—at any rate under this constitution—and which it was a waste of time to discuss.

MR. BROWN was sorry in one sense that these proposals were not likely to be granted under the present constitution, but in another sense he was glad, as it would only further tend to bring about a system of self-government. He was surprised at the sentiments and the views expressed by the hon. the Colonial Secretary on this subject. No doubt the hon. gentleman, like every other hon. member, was animated solely by a desire to promote the interests of the colony, and he was sure that those who had spoken in favor of the resolution had but one object in view—the development of the district. He had said he was somewhat surprised at the sentiments uttered by the Colonial Secretary; the hon. gentleman stated, in effect, that we were endeavoring to give these pastoral tenants of the Crown the right to pick out the eyes of their land, and to lock up the land. Why! at the present moment every lessee in the district could if he liked not only purchase five per. cent. of his land but the whole of it, in 200-acre blocks, at 10s. an acre. The question in his mind was simply this—was it desirable to handicap the settlers of this district in the development of the country by requiring them to take a large amount of money out of their pocket to purchase land now, to secure homesteads for themselves, instead of devoting that money to stocking their runs and improving them? One thing was very certain, these men would not voluntarily purchase at the present time, when they had got other demands on their pockets, in connection with the improvement of their runs, and he thought it would be very hard to compel them to purchase, or else give outsiders an opportunity of purchasing over their heads. The object of these proposals was simply to give these lessees a little time to husband their resources as it were,—to stock their leases, and to improve their runs, all of which necessitated a large expenditure of money, and the House was asked to give them some little time to do this, before compelling them to purchase any portion of their lands, which some of them could ill afford to do at present, with other and more pressing claims upon their pockets. What did the Colonial Secretary himself recommend to that House in 1878, the hon. gentleman at that time being at the head of the Lands Department, when the

Government was desirous of settling this Kimberley country—and it was all nonsense looking at this district as a pastoral El Dorado, all nonsense—no doubt there was some good land in the district, and some that was of very little use; fortunes might possibly be made there, and a great many fortunes lost. But what did the Colonial Secretary recommend with reference to the lands in this district when the hon. gentleman was Commissioner of Crown Lands five years ago? This was what the hon. gentleman recommended, in a memorandum on the special settlement of this territory: "Pastoral lands to be let on lease (say) for twenty-one years; first seven years at 2s. 6d. a thousand acres"—they were paying 10s. now; "second seven years at 5s. a thousand acres, and the remainder by lease at 7s. 6d. a thousand acres; the pre-emptive rights to be the same as are about to be allowed in the so-called Central, Eastern, and South-eastern districts under the land regulations." That was the hon. gentleman's opinion at that time, and it was known that lessees in those central districts had considerable pre-emptive rights then; and if the hon. gentleman's views held good at that time he thought they held good now. [THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not at all.] He would be the last to come forward to advocate the interests of any particular class at the expense of another class, but he most cordially supported the amendment, and he did so in the firm belief that, whereas it would tend materially to the more rapid development of the district, it would do no harm to anyone, while, on the other hand, it would prove of good service to Western Australia.

MR. CAREY was surprised to hear the hon. member for Gascoyne referring to opinions held by any hon. gentleman five years ago; he thought a great many hon. members in that House held very different opinions now to what they did less than five years ago, and especially the hon. member for the Gascoyne. [MR. BROWN: I doubt it.] Then the hon. member had said what he did not mean. [MR. BROWN: No, no.] He quite agreed with the Colonial Secretary that the settlers in this Kimberley district were, inch by inch, yard by yard, seeking to grasp the whole country. When they

took up land there they knew exactly upon what conditions they were taking it up, and there could be no doubt that they would get more than they ever had any reason to expect if the recommendations of the select committee of this session should be agreed to. It appeared to him that the suggestion made by the Colonial Secretary as to the rights of selection, for homestead purposes, was a fair suggestion. These lessees had the right of purchase already, and why should all the best land in the district be reserved from sale for many years to come—indefinitely he might say. It also appeared singular to him that, although this country may not be all that it was represented to be—that it was not the paradise they had been led to believe it was—it appeared very singular that those who were interested in it were so anxious to secure their land.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest) thought, looking at the subject altogether, it would be well if those gentlemen who were interested in these proposals would agree to let the matter stand over for a time. When hon. members had had an opportunity of thinking over it, probably they might be in a more liberal mood than those who had spoken on the subject that day. The House had already this session granted—or at any rate proposed to grant—the Kimberley lessees some further concessions, which would very much benefit them—[MR. CAREY: If approved]—and perhaps it was somewhat ill-timed to ask for more concessions, in view of the proposed modifications in the conditions as to stocking and location. As to the regulations put forward five years ago, those regulations were put forward when we knew hardly anything about the country; but since then we had become acquainted with it, and discovered it was not altogether a paradise. In his report, written after a recent visit to the district, he had very plainly expressed what he thought of the position of these pioneers, and what he said was this: "The Kimberley district is not a place where gold can be gathered without toil, nor can pearls and pearlshells be obtained without labor." [MR. CAREY: Where can they?] "It is merely a district with fertile plains which will, I believe

"and hope, be suitable for pastoral purposes, and its more Northern portion, in the future, for tropical culture; but those who venture in its development will have to incur a large expenditure in getting their stock to the country, and much trouble and difficulty and years of toil under a tropical sun before they make their fortunes, and they require the easiest terms and conditions; they require every encouragement and assistance in order to enable them to cope with the trials and difficulties they will have to encounter as pioneers in a new country." That was the opinion he had formed, after careful observation. Some hon. members seemed to think that land in the Kimberley district—because it was a long way off—was better than the land in any other part of the colony. In this case "distance lent enchantment to the view," and it was suggested that we should not part with the land at any price. Surely hon. members need not go as far as Kimberley to put that theory into practice. They might do that in Perth itself. If the Government ought not to part with the freehold of lands in the Kimberley district, but simply lease them, why not apply the same principle in other parts of the colony? Why should not the Government when disposing of town land insist upon leasing it only, and when the tenant had built a house on it, let the land revert to the Crown, so much improved in value? The principle was the same, whether land was disposed of in the settled parts of the colony or in the more distant portions of the country; and if hon. members were not prepared to apply the principle to all lands, he failed to see why they should seek to put their theories into practice in the Kimberley district alone. Everybody seemed to have their own particular views with regard to the conditions upon which that district ought to be settled. It was only the other day he noticed in a local newspaper a theory put forward by a sauce manufacturer from Sydney, the theory being that we should let the land for a hundred or a thousand years, and in the end let it revert to the State with all improvements made on it in the meantime. All this was very beautiful in theory, but it wouldn't work in practice. There was an innate feeling, which seemed to have been planted in the

breast of every Englishman, as to the possession of land, and until this feeling was eradicated it was useless talking about such theories as these. He should be pleased—and he thought it would be in the interest of the Kimberley settlers—if the House were to let this matter drop at the present time. Even under the proposed conditions, the lessees would not be able to avail themselves of this concession until they had stocked their runs, and that was not likely to be done in a day. Under these circumstances it appeared to him the pioneer settlers of the district had nothing to lose by postponing the consideration of this subject for the present. He would therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. STEERE must say he agreed very much with what had fallen from the Colonial Secretary,—that to give these lessees a pre-emptive right over five per cent. of their land would be virtually giving over to them the fee simple of their runs. It would at any rate give them such command over river frontages as would materially detract from the value of their runs hereafter, and the amendment proposed by the hon. member for the Murray appeared to him to go much further in this direction than was ever contemplated by the hon. member who brought forward the original motion (Mr. McRae), whose object, it was stated at the time, was merely to give the lessees a chance to secure their homesteads. To a certain extent he sympathised with those leaseholders, who probably had not the money at their disposal to purchase a selection, when they had a pre-emptive right to do so, and he should be prepared to go with the proposal so far as affording them an opportunity of securing a homestead, but certainly not to the extent of giving them a pre-emptive right over five per cent. of all their leases. The hon. member for the Gascoyne seemed to think that unless these concessions were granted under the present constitution the result would be that it would hasten on the adoption of Responsible Government. He (Mr. Steere) was sure that such a motion as this would never be carried in a House where the members were returned under Responsible Government. Such a proposal was far more likely to

be adopted under the present constitution than under a more popular system of Government. He begged to second the motion for adjournment.

MR. GRANT said there appeared to be a misapprehension on the part of some hon. members as to what was really sought for, which appeared to him to be only a fair and reasonable request on the part of the pioneer settlers. It was a mistaken idea altogether that people had only to go to this Kimberley district, and that their fortunes would then be made—a very mistaken idea indeed. No man need expect to derive any benefit from pioneering in that district, unless he made up his mind to spend ten or even twenty years in the country, subject to all the risks and hardships which accompanied pioneering. What had been the result in the North District? Many of those who invested a considerable amount of money in that district when it was first opened for settlement were now reduced to beggary; after years of toil they now went about decrepit and penniless.

MR. MARMION said he could not understand why there should be so much opposition to allow these leaseholders to purchase, seeing that there was nothing under the land regulations in force to prevent them from purchasing the whole of the river frontages now, if they liked, to the exclusion of all comers. It was said by several hon. members, the Colonial Secretary included, that these lessees already had more concessions granted to them than they were led to expect when they took up their land,—which was only another way of saying that they had got more than they deserved. But he took it that these concessions were granted as a matter of public policy, and not out of any particular regard for the lessee, the object in view being to increase the public revenue by stimulating settlement. Two years ago he raised his voice in that House against the conditions then imposed upon the pioneers of this district, and he was taunted with being actuated by self-interest. But who was right? Whose views had since proved to have been the correct views? Had not that House now conceded the very privileges he then fought for, and was it not prepared to concede still further privileges?

And why? Simply because it was considered a wise policy to encourage the development of the district, and thereby swell the revenue of the colony. That was all which hon. members thought of. It was not out of any consideration for the lessee. He considered that the Kimberley lessees, the bona fide settlers, had nothing whatever to thank that House for. He believed that, in a few years, those hon. members who now opposed the present proposals would be quite prepared to accede to them, in the same way as they had since acceded to concessions which they thought unreasonable at the time they were first put forward, a few years ago. He certainly had been surprised to hear the views expressed that day by the Colonial Secretary, when it was borne in mind that it was at the suggestion of that hon. gentleman himself that the land regulations which are now in existence throughout other parts of the colony permitted lessees to exercise pre-emptive rights throughout the whole term of their lease. He might also remind the hon. gentleman that he had seen no reason to change his views on that point as late ago as October of last year, when the amended regulations now in force were promulgated, and when the hon. gentleman occupied the position of Commissioner of Crown Lands. The hon. member for the Vasse said it was a singular thing that, although it was said the land in the Kimberley district was not worth so much as it was represented to be, still the lessees appeared very anxious to become possessed of it. That was a very natural desire, for, as had been said by the Surveyor General, there was an innate craving on the part of most Englishmen to become possessed of land of their own, and secure for themselves and their descendants a freehold. These Kimberley leaseholders were but human, they were only common mortals like ourselves, and he saw nothing singular, he saw nothing unreasonable, in the fact of their being anxious to get a homestead over their heads. The hon. member was so used to imagine that if any member of the House happened to be interested in any subject under discussion he must act dishonestly in the matter. Whether he (Mr. Marmion) was interested in the Kimberley district

or not, it was not the only district he was interested in; pastoral pursuits were not the only pursuits he was interested in; and, feeling as he did that in all his actions in that House he was only animated by a desire to benefit the colony at large, he could afford to allow such insinuations to pass, and to treat them with the contempt they deserved, no matter from what source they came. Nothing that could benefit any member of that House but would also benefit every other lessee in the district, or that would not eventually prove a substantial benefit to the colony.

MR. CAREY was surprised that an hon. member possessing the long experience of the hon. member for Fremantle was not more conversant with the rules of debate. He would recommend the hon. member to study a little more of May's Parliamentary Practice and less of the Kimberley land regulations; he would then see it was highly improper on his part to attribute motives to any hon. member in that House. [MR. MARMION: It's the hon. member himself who is so fond of attributing motives.] He had said nothing about any individual members of the House; what he stated was that, if the land in the Kimberley district was not so valuable as it was represented, it was very singular that lessees were so particularly anxious to acquire it. On the one hand they ran down the country, while with the other hand they were eager to grasp as much as they could of it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said his official name had been bandied about so freely in the course of the debate that he thought it was only right he should rise to say a word or two with reference to his actions in the past, in connection with these land regulations. The hon. member for the Swan and himself had been associated together for the last twelve years or more in endeavoring to frame regulations appropriate to the conditions of the colony, and he thought it might be said that on the whole they had succeeded to this extent—that the regulations generally had worked well, and were suitable to the requirements and conditions of the country. With regard to the pre-emptive rights which had been granted under the previous regulations, and which in part

remained still in force, he might say that ten or eleven years ago when the amended regulations were brought into operation it was then considered absolutely essential, in the interest of settlement, that run-holders should be offered every inducement to improve their runs. At that time shepherding was the order of the day, and fencing was looked upon with distrust; but a change had come over the spirit of their dream since then, and he was happy to think that the settlers of the colony generally had at last become imbued with the belief which he entertained years ago, that fencing would be found in the end more profitable than shepherding. He therefore maintained that these pre-emptive rights, so far as the more settled districts of the colony were concerned, had resulted beneficially; but if hon. members would look at the present regulations, they would see that to some extent these pre-emptive rights had been removed. When these Kimberley regulations were first framed, five years ago, the opinion then entertained of the district was that the country did not differ in character from that in other parts of the colony, within what he might call the dry belt,—in fact, little or nothing was known about the country, and the regulations were simply tentative. Since then the country had been explored, and we now knew more about it,—knowledge which he did not think the colony sufficiently appreciated. He might say that the colony generally owed perhaps more than it believed—at any rate more than it had shown its appreciation of—to the members of the Survey Department, who had devoted themselves for some years past in ascertaining what is the character of the interior of our vast territory. With regard to the question now under discussion, he did not himself see the utility or advisability of further considering the amendment now proposed, and he thought the best thing to be done under the circumstances was to agree to the motion for adjournment.

The motion for adjournment was then put, and the matter dropped.

#### DOG BILL.

The House then went into committee for the further consideration of the Dog Bill.



Clause 17.—“It shall be lawful for any person to lay a complaint before any Justice of the Peace to the effect that an aboriginal native has in his possession an unregistered dog which has killed, maimed, or wounded sheep, or an unregistered dog not required by the said native for the procuring of food and likely to cause injury to sheep. On reasonable grounds shown, the said Justice shall cause the said native to be summoned or brought before him, and shall investigate the said complaint. If the complaint be proved to the satisfaction of the said Justice, the said Justice, if he shall think fit under all the circumstances of the case, may order the destruction of the said dog; provided that no dog shall be destroyed under this section if upon demand, to be duly made by the Justice, the said native shall agree to register the said dog, and shall do so within one week, in which case the Justice shall cause the dog to be registered in the manner prescribed by this Act as nearly as may be, receiving and duly accounting for the registration fee. And provided further, that any native summoned or brought as aforesaid, and in possession of more than two unregistered dogs, shall be allowed to select and keep any two of such dogs neither of such dogs being proved to have killed, maimed, or wounded sheep; and no order for the destruction of dogs under this section shall apply to or include any dogs so selected and kept, and every dog registered by a native, under the provisions of this section, shall, during the period of registry, be exempted from the operation of any other provision of the section.”

MR. STEERE thought the clause ought to apply to horses and cattle, as well as sheep, and he would move that after the word “sheep,” in the fourth line, the words “cattle or horses” should be inserted.

This was agreed to.

MR. STEERE moved that the words “and likely to cause injury to sheep,” in the ninth line, be struck out. There were many dogs that ought to be destroyed, although not likely to cause injury to sheep — puppies for instance — which could not be destroyed if these words were allowed to stand part of the clause.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. STEERE said he had already pointed out the absurdity of giving a native a week's notice before destroying his dog, so as to afford him an opportunity to register it. The probability was that long before the week expired the native and his dog would have leaved, and the result would be these dogs would never be destroyed. He had therefore to move that all the words beginning with the word “provided,” in the 19th line, down to and including the word “fee,” in the 29th line, be struck out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser): Does the hon. member wish to insist that a native should not have the right to register a dog at all?

MR. STEERE said if the hon. gentleman would read a little further he would see that a native had a right to keep two dogs.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) thought the omission of the words “and shall do so within one week” would answer the hon. member's purpose. This would give the native an opportunity of registering his dog, if he chose to do so.

MR. WITTENOOM said the clause applied to dogs that had already destroyed sheep or cattle, and all a native would have to do to save his dog from being destroyed was to register it, if this clause became law.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. P. Hensman) did not think this power was a power likely to be acted upon—that a native would register his dog—but that in nine cases out of ten the dog would be destroyed. It would be seen, on reference to the latter portion of the clause, that a native was only empowered to keep two dogs, and that neither of them shall be dogs which shall have killed or maimed sheep or cattle.

MR. RANDELL thought it would be better to give justices discretionary power in regard to these matters. As the clause now stood a magistrate was bound to give a native a week's chance to register his dog, in any case, before it could be destroyed.

MR. MARMION failed to see why a native should not have the privilege of registering a dog if he wished to do so,

whether he actually wanted the dog or not.

MR. STEERE said a white man was liable to a very heavy penalty if he did not register his dog, but these penalties could not be enforced in the case of natives.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) could not help thinking that the omission of the words "within one week" would answer every purpose. If they were to strike out the whole proviso the object and intention of the Bill would be entirely defeated, and he must take the sense of the committee on the subject if the hon. member insisted upon pressing his amendment.

MR. MARMION suggested that the clause should provide that the dog which a native was to have an opportunity of registering should be a dog that had never been known to kill or maim sheep.

MR. STEERE said he would be prepared to accept that suggestion.

The clause was then put and passed, on the understanding that it should be amended upon the recommittal of the Bill.

Clause 18.—Order for the destruction of a dog to be in the form of the schedule:

Agreed to.

Clause 19.—"If any person shall produce to any Justice of the Peace the tail of a dog, and shall prove to the satisfaction of such Justice that it is the tail of a wild dog, he shall be entitled to a reward of shillings, to be obtained as hereinafter mentioned. The said Justice shall forthwith cause the said tail to be entirely destroyed in his presence, and he shall give the said person a certificate in writing, signed by the said Justice and certifying that the whole tail of a wild dog has been produced to him by the said person and has been entirely destroyed in his presence and that the said person is entitled to the sum of shillings as a reward for the destruction of a wild dog."

MR. STEERE did not think ten shillings would be too large a reward to offer for the destruction of a wild dog. It would be necessary to give people some incentive, and he did not think ten shillings would be more than the license fees would cover.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said his attention had been called to the fact that natives and shepherds had been in the habit of preserving the tails of wild dogs, and, very possibly, if a large reward were offered for the production of dogs' tails, some enterprising individual would mount his horse and collect all the preserved tails he could discover, paying perhaps a shilling apiece, and make a very good thing out of the business. He thought some provision ought to be made that the tails for which rewards were paid must be the tails of newly killed dogs, or perhaps it would be as well to offer the reward for the scalp or the ear of a dog, rather than the tail.

MR. WITTENOOM suggested that the reward in outlying districts should be 10s., and within the Central District 5s.

MR. MARMION pointed out the difficulty of distinguishing between the tail of a dog killed in an outlying district from that of a dog killed in the Central District. There was nothing to prevent a man killing his dogs in outlying districts, and bringing the tails in to the district where the larger reward was offered.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. P. Hensman) asked why it should not be incumbent upon the person producing a tail to prove to the satisfaction of the justice that the dog had been recently killed, as in the Rabbit Destruction Bill.

MR. WITTENOOM said these dogs were generally killed by shepherds in the bush, who perhaps did not come into town for months together.

MR. GRANT suggested that the reward be offered for the scalp, instead of the tail. There might be some difficulty in detecting whether the tail was the tail of a wild dog or not.

MR. STEERE was afraid if they compelled people to bring in the scalps of these dogs it would deter many persons from going to the trouble of destroying them, who would otherwise do so, if they only had to bring in the tail in order to obtain the reward. He would move that "10s." be inserted in the first blank, and that after the word "entitled," in the 5th line, the words "if such has been destroyed within the Central District" be

added; also that after the word "shillings," in the sixth line, the following words be inserted: "and if such dog has been destroyed in any district other than the Central District he shall be entitled to a reward of five shillings."

These were agreed to, and the clause as amended put and passed.

Clauses 20 to 24—agreed to without discussion.

Clause 25.—"All registration fees paid or recovered in any municipality shall be paid and belong to the council of the municipality; and all such fees paid or recovered elsewhere shall be paid into the Colonial Treasury. One half of all fines and penalties under this Act shall, in municipalities, be paid to the municipality, and shall elsewhere be paid into the Colonial Treasury; and one half of the said fines and penalties shall be paid to the person who has informed against the offender."

MR. WITTENOOM said there were several districts in the colony where there were no Municipal Councils, and he thought that in such cases the registration fees ought to go to the local Road Board.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said the Government were going to a good deal of trouble and expense in connection with this matter, and he thought it was only fair that the fees should go into the Treasury chest in those places where there were no Municipalities established.

The clause was then agreed to.

Clause 26—Incorporating sections of Shortening Ordinance:

Agreed to.

Postponed clause (No. 3)—agreed to.

Schedules 1, 2, 3, and 4:

Agreed to.

Schedule 5.—Magisterial order for destruction of a dog requiring the dog to be first "shown and made known" to the magistrate:

MR. STEERE said it would be very difficult in many case to comply with these conditions. The magistrate might be fifty miles away from where the dog was, and how was the constable to show the dog to the magistrate?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. P. Hensman) said there must be some means of identifying the dog, and it might be done in many ways. In order

to meet the difficulty pointed out by the hon. member for the Swan he would move that the words "shown and" be struck out. This would leave it for the constable to make known to the magistrate what dog he wanted an order for his destruction,—not necessarily by ocular demonstration.

This was agreed to, and the schedule as amended adopted.

Preamble and title agreed to.

Bill reported.

#### CONSIDERATION OF MESSAGE (No. 22): RELATING TO ROADS AND BRIDGES.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) moved the House should take into consideration the message received the previous day from His Excellency the Governor, relative to the upkeep and control of roads and bridges. In his message His Excellency said it had been suggested that the Roads Boards should be given the assistance of two Inspectors of Works, one for the northern and one for the southern districts of the colony, possessing the skilled knowledge necessary for the building and repair of bridges, and for the supervision of the more important contracts entered into by the Board. These officers, if appointed, might be nominally attached to the Public Works Department; but their services should be at the sole command of the different Roads Boards, and their salaries would be defrayed from the aggregate vote on the Estimates. His Excellency said it had been proposed, as an alternative to this arrangement, that the vote for roads and bridges should be divided into the two sub-heads of "Roads" and "Bridges and Culverts:" the former being administered by the Boards, and the latter by the Government, as having more at its command the professional knowledge required. The Governor, however, would prefer to see the powers and duties of the Roads Boards increased rather than diminished. His Excellency in his message said he would be glad of the advice of the Council with reference to these suggestions, and perhaps hon. members would now express their views on the subject.

MR. STEERE said he should not be prepared to agree at all with the suggestion as to the appointment of Inspectors, for he was quite certain that

such an arrangement would not work well. There would soon be a difference of opinion between the Roads Boards and these officers, as to the work to be done, and as to how it ought to be done. The system had already been tried, and found not to work well at all. Neither did he think it would be advisable to adopt the suggestion as to dividing the vote for roads and bridges into two separate heads, the roads to be under the management of the district boards, and the bridges and culverts to be under the control of the Government. They were all aware that when this was done under the Central Roads Committee it led to a great deal of unpleasantness and ill-feeling with reference to the expenditure of the money, and he felt sure that the proposed division of authority now suggested would not be conducive to the establishment or the maintenance of an amicable feeling between the Roads Boards and the Government; nor did he think it would tend to keep the roads and bridges of the colony in as good a state of repair and efficiency as if they were placed under one control. He did not quite understand what His Excellency meant when he said that "during the next year the Roads Boards will be upon a more independent and responsible footing than they had yet attained, for we shall be trusting to them entirely for our inland communications." His Excellency, he presumed, must be aware that these boards have in the past been in a perfectly independent position, and that they have been trusted entirely with the upkeep of our inland communications. He was glad, however, to hear His Excellency expressing his belief that the colony will lose nothing by placing confidence in the district Road Boards—a belief which he regretted to think had not been shared by the Government of the colony of late years. As a member of the Central Roads Committee, he was aware that some of these boards did not do their work so well as one could wish, but the majority of them had done very well indeed, with the small means at their disposal, and he felt sure that the confidence reposed in them by His Excellency would not be misplaced.

Mr. RANDELL concurred with His Excellency when he said that "our road

administration is beset with difficulties," which no doubt was a correct statement of the case. Charges of mismanagement and of waste—and sometimes, he thought, almost of misappropriation—had been made against some of these district boards; but he thought our greatest difficulty would be as regards the bridges, where specifications and plans might be necessary, and he thought it was worthy of consideration whether there should not be some skilled person to exercise a general supervision, especially in the more settled parts of the colony. He believed that, generally speaking, the Roads Boards did very well indeed, but at the same time he thought it was desirable that the House should consider this question of skilled supervision. He was quite sure of this—that one Inspector could not look after the roads of the whole colony, and, as he did not suppose the House would agree at any rate to more than one, this officer might confine his supervision to the more central districts, and be made responsible for the expenditure of public funds on the roads and bridges, and more particularly the latter.

Mr. CROWTHER said if the control and supervision of the expenditure were to be placed in the hands of the Government the result would simply be that the hands of the local boards—who as a rule knew infinitely more about the work than any Government officer—would be paralysed. If the direction of these works came from headquarters, the task of carrying them out ought also to be undertaken from headquarters. Any division of responsibility would create dissension and ill-feeling, as had been the case in the past, and he thought the best thing the Government could do was to let well alone. The hon. member, Mr. Randell, said he did not think one man could supervise all the roads of the colonies. No; nor ten men. What, then, was the use of appointing these officers merely for the name of the thing? The bridges of the colony were not very numerous, and generally speaking were not works of stupendous magnitude requiring much scientific skill to plan and carry them out. Should there be any larger bridge than usual required, surely the plans and specifications might be supplied by the Public Works Department. For his

own part he thought His Excellency the Governor had taken a very fair view of the position of affairs, and had only given the Road Boards their due, when he said that probably the most satisfactory result would, after all, be attained by adhering to the present system.

No other hon. member rising,

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said as there did not appear to be any desire on the part of the House to disturb the existing arrangements he would move the following reply to His Excellency's message:—That this Council, having carefully considered the points placed before them by His Excellency the Governor in his Message, are of opinion—(1.) That the removal of the entire control of the votes given to the District Roads Boards by the appointment of Inspectors of Works, whose services might be at the command of the different Roads Boards, is not at this time a step which will meet with general approval; and (2) that the separation of the votes for Roads and Bridges into two sub-heads ("Roads," and "Bridges and Culverts") will not, in their opinion, prove an advantageous arrangement.

The reply was then adopted.

#### REPLY TO MESSAGE (No. 26): RELATING TO INCREASES TO SALARIES OF PUBLIC OFFICERS.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said he understood the hon. member for the Swan had a resolution to move on the subject dealt with in His Excellency's messages to the House, relating to the salaries of public officers.

MR. STEERE said he had intended to have moved his resolution as an amendment upon the motion submitted by the hon. member for the Vasse, relating to an increase of salary for the Colonial Secretary and for one of the draughtsmen in the Survey Office; but, as that motion had been withdrawn, and it might be desirable to place on record some expression of the opinion of the House on the subject of the salaries of public servants, the resolution would answer just as well as a reply to His Excellency's message. He thought it would be found to be in accordance with the views expressed by the Governor

himself, and also in accord with the conclusion which hon. members had come to—that at this late period of the session it would be impossible for the Government to prepare a scheme which would do justice to all the civil servants, and which, at the same time, would be likely to meet the approval of the House. The resolution was as follows:—"The Council is in accord with His Excellency's views as expressed in his message to the effect that there are other officers of Government besides Magistrates' clerks whose claims to an increase of salary might fairly be considered, and is willing to consider any well prepared scheme for a revision of official salaries, but deems it unwise to accede to any isolated proposals for an increase to particular officers. The Council regret that, at this late period of the session, time does not permit of this question being satisfactorily dealt with by the Government, but at the next session of Council it is prepared to vote, on the Supplementary Estimates for 1884, such sums as may be agreed upon to provide for an increase of salaries, to take effect from such date as may be considered advisable by the Legislature."

MR. CAREY said it was satisfactory to him to think that the action he had taken in the matter would, at any rate, bring about an increase of salaries of public officers, a year sooner than it would otherwise probably have taken place.

The resolution was then affirmed.

#### LAND GRANT RAILWAY SCHEMES.

##### ADJOURNED DEBATE.

On the order of the day for the resumption of the debate upon the report of the select committee who had prepared a series of resolutions with reference to the schemes relating to Land Grant Railways (*vide p. 350 ante*),

MR. STEERE moved that the resolutions of the select committee be considered *seriatim*, paragraph by paragraph.

Agreed to.

Resolution (1) read:

Sub-section 1—agreed to, without discussion.

Sub-section 2—"That the survey for the railway lines should be commenced

"within a period of twelve months, and  
 "the work of construction within two  
 "years from the date of acceptance of the  
 "conditions, and that the lines should be  
 "completed in sections of twenty miles,  
 "while not less than fifty miles should be  
 "constructed in any one year. Upon the  
 "termination of the contracts the lines  
 "should be open for general traffic, and  
 "the number of trains to be run and the  
 "tariff of charges to be imposed should  
 "be subject to the approval of the Gov-  
 "ernment."

MR. MARMION said it appeared to him this paragraph did not convey what the select committee meant. It provided that not less than fifty miles of railway should be constructed in any one year; what the committee meant was that not less than fifty miles of *each* line should be constructed in one year, and, in order that there should be no mistake about it, he would move to insert the words "of each line" between the words "miles" and "should," in the fourth line.

This was agreed to, and the paragraph as amended put and passed.

Sub-sections 3 and 4 were agreed to, without discussion.

Sub-section 5.—"That in consideration  
 "of the construction, equipment, main-  
 "tenance, and working of the proposed  
 "railway lines the Crown should, upon  
 "the completion of every section of  
 "twenty miles, grant 12,000 acres of land  
 "in fee simple for every mile constructed;  
 "to be selected in the following manner:  
 "—The land to be granted in blocks of  
 "not less than 60,000 acres in extent,  
 "and to be situated within 30 miles of  
 "either side of the line. Provided that  
 "not more than half the frontage to the  
 "railway should be taken up by the  
 "Syndicate's selections; provided also,  
 "that no one block selected should have  
 "a frontage upon the line of more than  
 "20 miles in length. Seventy-five per  
 "cent. of the amount of land per mile  
 "agreed upon as payment for the con-  
 "struction of the lines should be given  
 "by Crown grants to the Syndicates  
 "upon completion to the satisfaction of  
 "the Government of each twenty-mile  
 "section, while the deeds of grant for  
 "the remaining 25 per cent. should not  
 "be issued until the whole of the line  
 "had been constructed. And in case the  
 "contract were not completed within the

"time agreed upon, unless such non-  
 "completion were due to some inevitable  
 "cause or to some act of the Government,  
 "the said 25 per cent. should not be  
 "granted, and all rights thereto should  
 "be forfeited."

MR. STEERE said although there was no difference of opinion in the minds of the members of the select committee as to the meaning of this clause, still, if left as now worded, it would afford the Syndicates an opportunity of leaving the Government with a very small frontage to the railway, which the committee did not intend should be the case. He did not think it would be a very easy matter to alter the wording of the clause in committee of the whole House, and he thought the best plan would be to refer it back to the select committee. As the paragraph was now worded, so long as the Syndicate took their land in 60,000 acre blocks, they could take them up in any shape, and leave the Government with very little frontage.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES pointed out that the select committee whose report was under consideration was now defunct, to all intents and purposes, but those who had served as members of the committee might of course meet and prepare an amendment, which might be submitted in due form for the consideration of the committee of the whole House.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) concurred with the hon. member for the Swan in his anxiety not to allow the Syndicates a monopoly of frontage.

MR. VENN thought, with all due deference to the members of the select committee, that the paragraph could be quite as well amended in committee of the whole House. It was a very simple matter. All that was required was to make provision that every block left for the Crown should have a depth of say 15 miles, which would preclude any infringement on their rights by the Syndicates.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) moved that the consideration of this paragraph be postponed for the present.

This was agreed to.

Sub-section 6—agreed to, *sub silentio*.

Sub-section 7—"That in connection  
 "with the construction of the railways

"and the occupation of the lands the constructing Syndicate should be required to introduce into the colony, from Europe, and within five years from the commencement of the contract, 5,000 statute adults of European extraction, the number introduced during any one year not being less than 1,000, except with the consent of the Government, nor, on the other hand, more than 1,000, unless Government concur in the expediency of introducing such larger number. For each statute adult so imported the Syndicate might be empowered to claim payment at the rate of £10 per head, or, in lieu of a money payment, might be permitted to select 50 acres of land, within a distance of 30 miles of the line—such 50-acre selections to be grouped in blocks of not less than 10,000 acres in extent, which blocks should be held in the form prescribed by the Land Regulations."

MR. MARMION said this paragraph was not very clearly worded. It provided that the constructing Syndicate should be required to introduce 5,000 immigrants into the colony; but, supposing these works were to be undertaken by two different Syndicates, independent of each other, would each be expected to introduce 5,000 immigrants, or would that number be divided between them. The paragraph would be all right in the event of one Syndicate undertaking the two lines.

MR. STEERE said his own impression was that it was not intended there should be introduced 1,000 immigrants annually in respect of each line. He did not think the colony could afford to pay the Syndicates £20,000 a year for immigrants.

MR. CROWTHER: Surely we may leave these details to the Executive Government.

MR. STEERE: I think the Government should understand that they are to be restricted to 1,000 immigrants a year, whether one Syndicate or two Syndicates undertake the works.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser): The intention of the committee is clear enough, and I do not think there need be any apprehension that *this* Government, at any rate, are likely to misinterpret it.

The sub-section was then agreed to, and the remaining sub-sections were adopted *sub silentio*.

Resolution (II)—agreed to without discussion.

Resolution (III)—"In making any agreement with a contracting Syndicate the House is of opinion that, so far as it is possible to do so, the interests of existing lessees of Crown Lands should be protected; also that they should be reimbursed by the Crown for the improvements they have effected upon their leases."

MR. STEERE thought there was a good deal in what had been said by the hon. member for Albany,—some of these lands would be improved to a considerable extent, and he thought they were calling upon the Crown to do more than they had a right to do in calling upon them to reimburse the lessees for all improvements. He thought it was unreasonable to call upon the Crown to pay for such improvements as fencing, and that it was a matter for serious consideration whether this paragraph ought not to be modified.

MR. BROWN thought the difficulty would be met by striking out the words "by the Crown." The House of course would look to the Government to protect these lessees, and to see that they were reimbursed by somebody. He begged to move that the words referred to be expunged.

This was agreed to, and the resolution as amended adopted.

Resolution (IV)—"This House while expressing the opinion that the proposals of Sir Julius Vogel and Mr. Audley Coote more nearly approach the terms for land grant railway construction embodied in the foregoing resolutions than those either of Colonel McMurdo or of Mr. Anthony Hordern, and that they apparently present an opportunity which it would regret to see lost for entering upon the large and important projects in view without delay, is nevertheless willing to accept his Excellency the Governor's suggestion, that the negotiations with the promoters should be concluded by his Government. Provided that in the event of any material departure from the basis recommended by this House being found necessary, a final ratifi-

"cation of the agreement by the Legislature should be obtained, with the least possible delay."

MR. VENN said it might not appear to be of much importance, but he thought it would be better to strike out the word "apparently." This word implied that there was a doubt about the matter, whereas in reality there was nothing doubtful about it, and he thought the House would like to express a decided opinion on the point. He would move that the word "apparently," in the 9th line, be struck out.

MR. BURT said he should be constrained to vote against the word being struck out. The hon. member seemed to think that Sir Julius Vogel's scheme offered such great advantages in comparison with the other schemes put forward, that it would ultimately be accepted by the Government. He simply rose to point out that there were many features in the scheme submitted by Colonel McMurdo that should commend it, and he believed would commend it, to the Government when they came to enter into negotiations with the contracting parties. With regard to the Albany end of the line, for instance: both Sir Julius Vogel and Mr. Hordern merely proposed to take their line into Albany, where it would be of very little use compared with a line that went into deep water, where the P. & O. steamers lie, which was Colonel McMurdo's proposal. If either of the two offers were accepted, in their present shape, it would involve very serious additional expense indeed, inasmuch as it would necessitate the construction of a line through Albany to deep water, and also the construction of at any rate one large pier. Then again as regards the question of immigration, he submitted that Colonel McMurdo's scheme offered advantages which none of the other proposals presented. Sir Julius Vogel asked for an allowance of £10 in respect of every statute adult introduced by the syndicate (or an equivalent value in land), and Mr. Hordern also asked for a money payment, at the same rate, or 120 acres of land for each adult, and 60 acres for every infant introduced by his syndicate, whereas Colonel McMurdo asked for no payment whatever, either in money or land, in respect of the immigrants he proposed to introduce, his

proposal being to introduce forty immigrants, free of cost, to the colony, for each mile of railway built. This would represent about 8800 immigrants, to be introduced, within the next five years, without any expense to the colony; and putting the cost of introducing immigrants at £15 per head, which was a low rate compared to what we now paid, this would represent a sum of £132,000. He had no desire whatever to press the claims of this particular scheme upon the consideration of the House, at this stage, and he simply referred to these features of it as deserving the attention of the Government when conducting their negotiations.

MR. CAREY regretted to find the hon. member for the Murray supporting a scheme which did not meet with the approval of the majority of the House, and one which was not likely to receive any consideration on account of the large money payment which it involved. For his own part he felt very much inclined to support Vogel's scheme, and he was quite prepared to support the hon. member for Wellington's amendment to strike out the word "apparently."

MR. BURT said he had merely drawn attention to certain features in Colonel McMurdo's scheme, which appeared to have been overlooked. He was not at all prepared to say it was the best scheme, nor to disagree with the report of the committee. He had simply drawn the attention of the Government to some of the distinctive features of the scheme. The Government might be able to obtain terms even more advantageous to the colony than were presented by any of these schemes.

The amendment proposed by Mr. Venn was then put and negatived.

MR. CAREY thought it would be very desirable to strike out the words "is willing to accept." Why not leave the matter absolutely to the Governor and say that the House accepted His Excellency's suggestion, and not merely that it was willing to accept it?

MR. VENN was very much of the same opinion. He thought the House should not hesitate to accept His Excellency's suggestion.

MR. CAREY having formally moved that the words "nevertheless accepts" be inserted in lieu of the words "is never-



theless willing to accept," the amendment was put and negatived.

The resolution was then agreed to, as printed.

Progress was then reported, and leave given to sit again.

The House adjourned at six o'clock, p.m.

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

*Wednesday, 29th August, 1883.*

Remission of Royalty on Guano—Petition (No. 3): Railway between Bunbury and Jarrah Forests—Vote for Aboriginal Department: How expended—Message (No. 28): Statement of Proposed Expenditure on Works and Buildings—Message (No. 29): Appointment of Mr. Justice Stone as Delegate to Intercolonial Convention—Message (No. 30): Inland Mail Service, Curmarvon—Message (No. 31): Papers to Hydrophobia—Consideration of Loan Estimates, 1884—Fussie Judge's Salary Bill: first reading—Shipping and Pilotage Acts Amendment Bill: first reading—Capitation Allowances for Orphanages—Forest Reserve to Messrs. Smith & Co.—Northern District Survey: Return of Expenditure—Consideration of Message (No. 24): Telegraph Office Hours—Dog Bill: recommitted—Land Grant Railways Schemes: Adjourned debate—Rabbits Bill: second reading—Estimates: in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

### REMISSION OF ROYALTY ON GUANO.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser): A few days ago the hon. member for Fremantle asked me when the Government intended to carry out the wishes of the Council as expressed in a certain resolution passed during the session of 1879, having reference to the remission of duty or royalty upon guano gathered upon the islands or coast of the colony, and sold for use in the colony. I informed the hon. member at the time that I was in communication with the Collector of Customs, with the view of

ascertaining the exact loss to the revenue which would be entailed by the proposed remission of duty on royalty, and that so soon as I obtained this information I would give a reply to the hon. member's question. I am now in possession of a return from the Collector of Customs, which shows that the receipts on this account for the last three years have averaged £92 15s. 4d. a year. This indicates that the matter is of small account, and that the charges cannot be regarded as heavy. There is really no reason why this royalty should be remitted, any more than rent charges received from the holders of occupied land of any class, and the proposal if carried into effect would be difficult to arrange satisfactorily.

### PETITION (No. 3): RAILWAY FROM BUNBURY TO JARRAH FORESTS.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) laid on the table a petition from the inhabitants of Bunbury in favor of establishing railway communication between Bunbury and the Jarrah Forests.

### VOTE FOR ABORIGINAL DEPARTMENT: HOW EXPENDED.

MR. MARMION, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table—

"1st. Particulars as to how the sum of £550 placed upon the Estimates for 1884, under the heading of 'Aboriginal Department,' and described as 'Board and Clothing of Children at Perth and Busselton,' is proposed to be expended.

"2nd. Particulars as above with reference to the item of £700 under same heading, and described as 'Clothing and Blankets.'

"3rd. Particulars as to how the items above mentioned voted for the year 1882 were expended in that year, what persons were the recipients, and, in the case of the second item, in what districts the 'Clothing and Blankets' were distributed, and by whom?"

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said the returns asked for would be furnished at an early date.