

chamber system, in the present House, he still had a chance of bringing his views before the country, and, if he could persuade the constituencies to come to his own way of thinking, the hon. member might come back to another House with a majority in favor of a single chamber. Personally he was entirely opposed to the unicameral system, but, as the hon. member had not yet favored them with any arguments in support of his own particular views, but simply introduced his resolutions, it was no use attempting to anticipate his arguments. But he did not think anything would convince him that a single chamber constitution would be a good thing for Western Australia. He would not detain the House at present; he had only spoken for the purpose of giving the hon. member for Greenough time to consider what course he should take with respect to his resolutions.

MR. RICHARDSON said that, in order to get out of the difficulty, he would move that the debate be adjourned until Friday evening.

MR. SCOTT seconded the motion. He agreed with the hon. member for Greenough in wishing to see this question pressed forward to a settlement as quickly as possible. There were points involved in the hon. member's resolutions which went to the very root of the whole question, but it would be difficult to proceed to discuss them until they had heard the hon. member's own views upon them.

The motion to adjourn the debate until Friday was agreed to.

Friday, 23rd March, 1888.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT : MR. PARKER'S RESOLUTIONS TRAVERSING SECRETARY OF STATE'S DESPATCHES.

MR. PARKER, in accordance with notice, rose to submit the following resolutions for the consideration of the House :—

[*Responsible Govt.*

That this Council, having taken the two despatches of the Secretary of State, dated 12th December, 1887, and 3rd January, 1888, on the subject of constitutional change for Western Australia, into careful consideration, resolves as follows :—

(1.) That to indicate, at the present time, the possible future boundary of a Northern political subdivision of the Colony would be premature and open to serious objection; and that in any case the line suggested by the Secretary of State would be most undesirable.

(2.) That special statutory reservation to Her Majesty's Government in the Constitution Act of power to control legislation affecting Northern lands is unnecessary, the Crown having a right of veto upon all such legislation.

(3.) That the proposed arrangement for funding the proceeds of sales of Northern lands, with a view to their future local use, would be a needless complication, the Regulations lately sanctioned by the Secretary of State not contemplating alienation of those lands except in townships and in special areas.

(4.) That the Constitution of the Colony should, from the first, provide for the establishment of a second Legislative Chamber.

(5.) That the second House of Western Australia should be elected by the people.

(6.) That in view of persistent differences of opinion disclosing themselves between the Legislative Chambers, it is highly desirable that definite provision should be made for peaceable and final settlement of disputes, and, at the same time, for preserving the co-ordinate powers and equal authority of the two Houses in the passing of laws.

(7.) That no ground whatever of necessity has been shown for placing the interests of the aboriginal population in the hands of a body independent of the local Ministry.

The hon. member said he intended, with regard to these resolutions, to ask the House to consider them separately, in committee of the whole House. In a matter of such very great importance as

this, he thought it would be wise for them to have the largest possible amount of discussion, the most exhaustive debate, and to have every opinion represented with regard to the various propositions that would be submitted for their consideration. Such being the case he thought it would be wise to have these discussions in committee, but, before moving the Speaker out of the chair, he desired to say a few words as to the resolutions generally, and as to the position in which the subject now stood. He need not labor the previous history of Responsible Government in this colony; he need not go back and recount how any particular member had voted or spoken on the subject, for he thought he would only weary the House, and he saw no use in going into such matters. He took it that all of them were aware that what they had now to consider were the two despatches from the Secretary of State, presented to the House by His Excellency the Governor, and which were in reply to the two resolutions passed last year by that House in favor of Responsible Government, and Responsible Government for the whole colony. He found that the Secretary of State had drawn His Excellency's attention to various points, and had made certain suggestions upon which he desired the opinion of the House. Sir Henry Holland had specially asked the Governor to lay these despatches before that House, and to seek their opinion upon them. He also asked that any resolutions the House might pass in reply should be sent to the Colonial Office. Indeed, although these despatches had passed between the Governor and the Secretary of State, the communications were really to that House, and they were then virtually discussing the subject with the Secretary of State, with the Colonial Office, and with Her Majesty's Government. Now the points with regard to which the Secretary of State desired their opinion were these: firstly, he suggested "that for the purpose of dealing with all questions as to the disposal of waste lands of the Crown, the colony should be taken to be divided at about latitude 26 (or in the neighborhood of the Murchison River)." Secondly, the Secretary of State proposed that "it should be lawful for the Legislature of Western Australia to regulate, by Act,

passed in the usual way, the sale, letting, and other disposal of the waste lands of the Crown south of that line, and the disposal of proceeds arising therefrom." He was sure no hon. member would take exception to that. Then came a third proposal, which related to the regulations affecting the disposal of Crown lands in the territory north of the boundary referred to. Sir Henry Holland's suggestion with regard to this point was:—"That all regulations affecting the sale, letting, disposal, and occupation of waste lands of the Crown in the territory north of that line shall remain under the control of Her Majesty's Government, the proceeds of all land sales being invested at interest, to form a fund, of which the principal would be reserved for the benefit of any colony or colonies which may hereafter be created in such Northern territory, except in so far as it may from time to time be expended, with the sanction of Her Majesty's Government, for the special advancement of the districts in which it was raised, either by the settlement of emigrants therein or in other ways; while the interest of this fund, as well as all rents and other land revenue of an annual character, not being instalments of money paid under a system of conditional purchase, would form part of the general revenue and be subject to the vote of the Legislature of Western Australia." What the Secretary of State virtually suggested was that the lands north of a certain line should remain under the control of the Imperial Government, that legislation respecting them should be subject to the control of the Crown, and that all moneys resulting from the sale of these lands should be applied to form a separate fund, and remain available for the benefit of any future colony or colonies which may hereafter be established in that part of the country. At the same time, Her Majesty's Government, apparently, were willing that the local Legislature should, until the colony came to be divided, have the use of the revenue derived from the rents of land leased in this northern territory—but not the revenue from land sold or alienated—and also of the interest accruing from the fund referred to. This, then, was one very important subject which they had to consider, and to express their

opinion upon, for the Secretary of State. Turning to the second despatch from Sir Henry Holland, they would find that he commenced with certainly a very important subject—the question of whether we should have one Legislative Chamber or two, to constitute the future Parliament of Western Australia. Sir Henry Holland, while admitting that a second chamber would be necessary in the future, suggested that for the present we should be content with one chamber, until the colony possessed a population of 80,000 inhabitants, until such date as Her Majesty in Council shall decide to call into existence a second chamber. This certainly was another topic which they would have to take into their most grave consideration, and debate in the most exhaustive manner, before arriving at a decision upon it. Then, again, they found another subject referred to by the Secretary of State—that referred to by the Governor in one of his despatches where His Excellency suggests that, in the event of our having two Houses, the Legislative Council, or the Upper House, should have power to reject anything of the nature of “a tack;” which virtually meant, that, presuming the Lower House were to pass (say) a bill in favor of the payment of members, and the Legislative Council were to reject such a measure, the Lower House should not have the power to “tack” on the Appropriation Bill a vote for the payment of members. That was the suggestion of the Governor. His Excellency also suggested that, in order to obviate a deadlock between the two Houses, the Lower House should have the power—but only by a two-thirds majority, and after an interval of at least eight months—to pass and send to the Governor, without the consent of the Upper House, a separate bill containing the measure previously objected to. He must say that certainly appeared, on the face of it, rather a radical proposition. To this suggestion of the Governor’s the Secretary of State took exception, being rather of opinion that it would be better to leave the two Houses to fight the matter out themselves, as time progressed. This was another subject of considerable importance, to which it would be necessary for them to devote their attention. The resolutions which he had proposed,

[*Responsible Govt.*

it would be found, dealt with these subjects, referred to by the Secretary of State, and with these subjects only. For instance, his first proposition related to the Secretary of State’s suggestion as to a division of the colony at about latitude 26; and it set forth “that to indicate, at the present time, the possible future boundary of a Northern political subdivision of the colony would be premature and open to serious objection, and that in any case the line suggested by the Secretary of State would be most undesirable.” Then with regard to Sir Henry Holland’s second suggestion, he submitted “that special statutory reservation to Her Majesty’s Government, in the Constitution Act, of power to control legislation affecting Northern lands is unnecessary, the Crown having a right of veto upon all such legislation.” His next resolution dealt with the suggestion of the Secretary of State that the proceeds of sales of Northern lands should be funded. This, he submitted, would lead to needless complication, as the Land Regulations lately sanctioned did not contemplate the sale or alienation of these lands, except in townships and within special areas. His fourth proposition related to the Secretary of State’s suggestion that for the present the colony should be content with one chamber. He did not approve of this suggestion, and therefore submitted that the new constitution should from the first provide for the establishment of two Houses. He further provided that the second chamber, or Upper House, should be elected by the people, and not a nominated assembly. His last resolution dealt with the question of the control of the aboriginal natives. It would be borne in mind that the Governor, in addressing the Secretary of State, made rather a suggestion to Sir Henry Holland that the present Aborigines Protection Board should be continued independent of the Ministry for the time being, and under no Parliamentary control whatever, and that this Board should have voted a certain sum—the Governor had suggested £5,000—which they should expend as they thought advisable in the interests of the natives. It was not suggested by the Governor that the Board should have power of legislation, nor was it suggested that the power of

legislation regarding the natives should be taken away. The Secretary of State in his despatch rather approved of the suggestions of the Governor, and he took it that the views referred to by the Governor were such as would prevail with the Colonial Office. He had taken exception to that view in the seventh resolution. He had only indicated the character of the resolutions that he intended to bring before the House. He had not attempted to discuss them on their merits; and he would ask hon. members, when they came to discuss these matters in committee, to bear this in mind, that the more moderate, the more temperate the manner in which they discussed them, the better it would be in the interests of all parties concerned. They had already decided that the colony should have Responsible Government, and what they wanted now was the best possible Constitution, the Constitution that would best promote the interests of the colony, and the welfare of its inhabitants. If they approached the subject with temperance and with a desire to unite together in harmony with a view to obtaining the best possible Constitution, they should be working very much better in the interests of the people than if they approached it with excited and aroused feelings. There was no reason, so far as he could see, at present for them to be annoyed at any action of the Governor or Secretary of State. As the Secretary of State had pointed out, this was a subject of very great importance to the interests of the colony—one that required grave consideration. Western Australia, though her population was small, had vast territory, and one could well imagine that when looking at this question of granting self-government, the Colonial Office, bearing in mind that there was a population of only 40,000, it should seem to them a matter of grave importance whether it would be advisable to grant the whole colony to such a small population. He could not but think that looking at it from this standpoint—the standpoint of the Colonial Office—we ought not to take any exception to the line that had been adopted by the Secretary of State. The Governor in the first instance had advocated the views of hon. members, and had gone further, and in a despatch had

stated that the colony had passed the stage at which the present Constitution could be satisfactorily worked. The Colonial Office had accepted their resolutions in principle, and the desire of the Colonial Office, and of the Governor, was that they should obtain the best possible Constitution. Therefore, he thought they had no grounds of complaint, so far as the Colonial Office or the Government, and the Governor were concerned, at the present time. If they found the Colonial Office thwarted their wishes—or tried to delay this change from being effected, or to keep the colony in leading strings—then would be the time to arouse the colony to energetic action. But, at the present time, he could not but think that it would be wise of them to work as harmoniously as they could with a view to getting the best possible Constitution. They often saw articles in newspapers reflecting upon hon. members of that House, and upon them as a body, but he did not think that it was advisable in that House to try and bring newspaper articles under discussion. He did not think it would tend to promote the object they had in view, if they tried to indicate who the author of particular articles might be, or to hint that he might be actuated by particular motives. It would be better for them in that discussion to ignore anything like personalities whatever, and to ignore anything that might excite hostility against the measure. Their first object ought to be union; they should endeavor to act as one man in the direction of the one object they had in view—the securing of the best possible Constitution for the colony. They were considering matters that would be of importance not only to the colony to-day, or next year, or five years hence, but perhaps to the colony for the next hundred years. Let them go calmly into the consideration of these matters, discarding all personalities, eschewing all matters foreign to the subject, and uniting with one accord in doing the best they possibly could in the interests of Western Australia. He now begged to move that the Speaker do leave the chair, for the purpose of considering the resolutions standing in his name, in committee of the whole House.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said he rose to second the motion. Of course it caused him some regret that he

should not be able to take part in these discussions; but, no doubt, it was very much better for the House to have them in committee. He could see that; and, as he should not be able in committee to join in the discussions, perhaps the House would bear with him while he said a few words with regard to questions which were of very deep interest to himself in connection with these resolutions, and the action which we proposed to take. There was another ground why he wished to say a few words before they went into committee, and that was with reference to certain remarks about himself with which the hon. member for Greenough in his speech the other evening had honored him. The drift of those remarks, so far as he could gather, was to throw a doubt on the sincerity of his desire to forward this question of constitutional change, with the view, he presumed, of throwing suspicion on any course of action with which he might now happen to be in accord. He should not say anything about that. The House knew him, and it knew the hon. member, and he did not think it would have very much difficulty in deciding between them. But he wished to be perfectly open, and he would say that he still did not approve of the principle of Responsible Government. He was not at all singular in entertaining that view. He held the opinion in very good company. He did not suppose the hon. member for the Greenough was in the habit of reading the papers of the other colonies; if he were, he would have seen that, a short time ago, Mr. Gillies, the Premier of Victoria, a well known statesman, in addressing his constituents, said that if Responsible Government continued to be worked as at present, it would be absolutely necessary to make some radical change in the constitution. In New Zealand recently they had appointed a select committee to try and devise some means of lessening the evils of Responsible Government; and, in New South Wales, Sir Henry Parkes was now trying to adopt some measure which will have the same effect there. Therefore, he did not think he was at all singular, or to be looked upon with contempt, because he did not think the principle of Responsible Government was a good one. He was inclined far more in favor of the American principle. But he could see perfectly

[*Responsible Govt.*

well that our present constitution was becoming unworkable. There was not the slightest doubt of that; they could all see it; and, in dealing with constitutional change, he did not see what finality we could attain unless we adopted that form of Government which was common to every English community. Therefore he was heart and soul with other hon. members in desiring to bring about Responsible Government as soon as we could, and also at the same time—to quote the words of the American Constitution—in tying down from mischief our future politicians by the chains of a well-framed constitution. To this end—that of hastening the adoption of the proposed change—he should be prepared to go further than the hon. member for Greenough or the hon. member for Wellington, for it appeared to him that neither of these gentlemen proposed to assist us at all in our present difficulty. For his own part he should be prepared to make considerable concessions to get out of that difficulty. It appeared to him that the plan which the hon. member for Wellington proposed to adopt was based upon that adopted by New South Wales. He fancied that was the model in the hon. member's mind. In New South Wales, a select committee was appointed and a Constitution Bill brought in; but it did not help them in the least. Besides they were informed that it was an unconstitutional proceeding, because a bill with a Civil List could only be brought in constitutionally by the Government. What was done there was this: in January, 1853, the late Charles Wentworth, who at that time led the Legislature of the mother colony, had a committee formed in the House which began to draft a Constitution Bill, and negotiations proceeded with the Colonial Office until, he thought, somewhere about the end of the year, when the principle of Responsible Government was accorded. He fancied from the resolutions of the hon. member for the Greenough that the hon. member must be of opinion that Responsible Government was introduced by a clause in the Constitution Act. That was not the case. These Constitution Acts did not mention Responsible Government. The way Responsible Government was introduced was simply by instructing the Governor with regard to

certain appointments. In New South Wales the instructions of the Duke of Newcastle, the then Secretary of State, to the Governor of that colony, were in these words: "With regard to all future appointments to situations of that class which are ordinarily regarded as subject to change with a change of administration, you should make candidates for them fully aware that these can now only be taken subject to the contingency of removal without compensation." That was the introduction of Responsible Government in New South Wales. But the instructions went on to say that the principle must not be applied, or that it would be dangerous to apply it, until the Legislative Council had passed a bill constituting two Houses; and it was two years before the negotiations were completed, and the Constitution Bill, based upon these negotiations which had taken place between the House and the Secretary of State, was passed. Yet, in the case of New South Wales, there was no opposition on the part of the Home Government or of the Imperial Parliament to the granting of these constitutional privileges. But we were in a totally different position. We had to face opposition. We had to face the opposition of the English people through the press and in Parliament, and we had to face the fact that the Under Secretary of State had quite recently pledged himself that we should not have the control of the whole of the waste lands of the colony. But, so far as he could see, the hon. member for Greenough and the hon. member for Wellington wished to take no notice whatever of this objection, or take no notice whatever of these despatches of the Secretary of State which pointed out the position and which suggested means of avoiding the difficulty, and which asked the Legislature here to assist him in arriving at a basis upon which the opposition might be overcome. These hon. members proposed to take no steps to answer the Secretary of State's despatches, but to ignore them altogether. They simply wished to curtly send him a bill as their ultimatum. This appeared to him an absurdly unpractical method of proceeding. The resolutions of the hon. member for Perth, so far as they went, would, he thought, answer the purpose in view. With regard to the

control of Crown lands, he was ready to make concessions which he thought would have the effect of completely removing the difficulty in which we stood—the chief difficulty, in fact the only real difficulty. Apparently the two hon. members he had named would not budge an inch with regard to this difficulty; but he himself would be prepared to make considerable concessions. His proposition was that agrarian legislation should be reserved for the approval of the Home Government, and thus the English Parliament would have the assurance that Land Acts could not be passed of which they disapproved. He did not see that any injury would result from this. At present, Land Regulations were framed here and referred to the Secretary of State, and no inconvenience resulted. The course that he suggested seemed to him to be that contemplated by the hon. member for Perth in his second resolution. With regard to the question of having one chamber or two chambers, he thought that the hon. member for the Greenough, if he were better acquainted with the working of Responsible Government in the other colonies, would say that the majority of the hon. members of that House were right in the view they took upon this point. The hon. gentleman had had English experience, but at Home they did not pay much attention to the working of Constitutions in the colonies. At Home members of Parliament were sent by their constituencies to represent certain broad principles, whereas, as a matter of fact, in Australia, as a rule, they were not sent in for any such purpose, but simply as commission agents to scramble for money; and it was not to restrain the will of the people but to restrain the eccentric individuals sent in as commission agents for them that they wanted an Upper House. Only the other day, in New South Wales, a batch of what they called "Parliamentary railways" were sent up by the Assembly to the Upper House, which was not a strong House—nominated Houses seldom were as strong as elected ones, and the New South Wales Council was considered extremely weak—but it cut them down to one, and it did this with the applause of the country. With regard to the 6th resolution of the hon. member for Perth's

proposals, that relating to the prevention of deadlocks between the two chambers, he might state incidentally that he heard his hon. friend on his right say "Bosh" when he heard the resolution read out. But he thought the hon. member would hardly say "Bosh" when he found that the proposal which it alluded to was one by Mr. James Service, one of the best of our Australian statesmen, who strongly advocated it; and those who knew the evils of these deadlocks in Victoria would admit that some means of arriving at a settlement of occasional disputes of this kind between the two Houses was highly desirable. However, this was a point for after consideration. If this was the time for bringing in a bill, instead of for negotiating with the Colonial Office with the view of arriving at some basis of agreement which we must arrive at before we could pass a bill, he should be well disposed towards many, if not most, of the resolutions of the hon. member for Wellington, but he did not agree with the hon. member's proposal as regards the constitution of the Upper House—though he could see, he thought, the object which the hon. member had in view, namely, to make provision for accustoming the people to place in the Upper House the sort of men who ought to find seats in it. But he thought himself it would be better to have an elected Upper House from the first. Apart from that he was in general accord with the resolutions of the hon. member for Wellington; but he did not think this was the time for bringing them on. With regard to the proposals of the hon. member for the Greenough, he must say he scarcely agreed in the least with any of them. In the first place it was perfectly absurd to introduce into a Constitution Bill a provision to the effect that the Executive Government of the colony shall consist of a Governor appointed by the Queen, and of a certain number of ministers of the Crown, who shall form the Cabinet. That was a matter-of-course. With regard to the hon. member's second resolution, indicating the officials who should form the Ministry, he thought it was highly undesirable in a Constitution Act to point out who the ministers should be. He knew it had been done in the first Constitution Acts,

with a view to the Civil List; but it had been found so inconvenient that it was done away with afterwards; and, in Victoria, now, they had a lump sum placed on the Civil List which was divided amongst the members of the Ministry. With regard to the hon. member's third resolution, which provided that the members of the Ministry must all be members of the Parliament of the colony, he objected to that; and some hon. members would know what he meant. There had been great difficulty, for instance, often experienced in obtaining a good Attorney General, and it had been proposed once or twice, in order to obviate this difficulty, that it should not be absolutely necessary that every Minister should have a seat in Parliament. The proposal contained in the hon. member's fifth resolution, that we should at first have a single chamber, but that if this chamber afterwards desired at any time to create a second chamber it should have the power to do so, seemed to him a very extraordinary one. It was perfectly certain that no House to which uncontrolled power had been given would, of its own accord, in order to restrain itself and diminish its power, part with it to another chamber. With regard to the electoral arrangements suggested by the hon. member he had this to say: he thought it would be highly undesirable to place all these electoral matters in the Constitutional Act. He was aware there were some electoral provisions included in the earlier Constitutional Bills, but they had since been eliminated, and now they were all confined to the Electoral Act, in order that there should be no constant tampering with the Constitution Act by reason of electoral changes. However; in his opinion, as he had already said, this was not the time for introducing a Constitution Bill; and, even if it were the time, he considered we ought to proceed in a constitutional way, and that the Government should do it themselves. He did not see why the House should take upon itself the burden of framing a Constitution Bill. The Government had all the material before them, and would know what would be in accord with the feelings of members and of the people of the colony. But at present we had a difficulty to face, and if we were to bring in a bill or bills, as the hon. member for

[*Responsible Govt.*

Greenough and the hon. member for Wellington proposed, we should be no nearer attaining our object. What we had to do now was clear, he should think, to every man of common sense; and that was to face this difficulty, answer the Secretary of State's objections, and try to arrive, in combination with him, at the bases upon which we shall frame our Constitution Act. Without that, it was perfectly certain we should never get it.

The House then went into committee of the whole, for the consideration of the resolutions in detail.

IN COMMITTEE:

MR. PARKER said he rose for the purpose of moving the first resolution standing in his name. It was this: "(1) 'That to indicate, at the present time, 'the possible future boundary of a 'Northern political subdivision of the 'colony would be premature and open to 'serious objection, and that, in any case, 'the line suggested by the Secretary of 'State would be most undesirable.'" It would be observed that the Secretary of State suggested that, for the purpose of more effectually dealing with all questions affecting the disposal of Crown lands, and also, apparently, with the view of defining the possible boundary of a future Northern colony, the boundary line should be fixed at about latitude 26, and he proposed that the lands of the colony north of that line should be dealt with in a different manner from that in which they were dealt with south of that boundary. Sir Henry Holland's suggestion was that as regards the southern part of this territory the Legislature should have the entire control and management of the waste lands, but that as regards the northern territory the waste lands shall remain under the control of Her Majesty's Government. The Secretary of State had, apparently, fixed this line at the 26th parallel of latitude, simply because he had been informed by the Governor that north of that line the number of inhabitants did not exceed 2,000 persons. That was the only reason which the Secretary of State gave in his despatch for suggesting this boundary; and he did not know that the Secretary of State had any other reason. He did not know himself why the line

should have been fixed at latitude 26. Looking at the map of the colony, and knowing as they did the various industries and pursuits in which the population were engaged, they could not but think—presuming a division of the colony did take place—that the people of a great portion of the country North of that line would much prefer to belong to the Southern colony than to the Northern colony. Their interests were more identical with those of the inhabitants of this part of the colony. One could quite imagine that as Western Australia advanced, and the population of our Northern territory increased, the residents of the more northern portion of that territory would desire to form themselves into a separate province; but he thought that desire would arise principally from those who did not follow the same occupations, or employ the same class of labor, and who were not engaged in the same industries, and whose interests were not identical with those of the residents of the more southern portion. Whenever the cry for separation did arise it would come from these, whose interests, as he had already said, would be opposed to our own. This would apply to those engaged in the mining industry, in the Kimberley district, for instance. We knew very well that, presuming these goldfields become largely developed, as he hoped they may, we should before long have a population of considerable magnitude in that part of the colony, and a desire growing up for separation, and for a Government of their own. He could quite understand such being the case. But he thought these remarks would principally apply to that portion of our territory situated north of about the 19th parallel of latitude, and not the 26th as suggested by the Secretary of State. Presuming, however, there had been any necessity at present for fixing a boundary line for the future Northern colony, he thought the more natural boundary would be at the Tropic of Capricorn ($23\frac{1}{2}$ deg. N.). All the inhabitants of the Roebourne or the North district (of which Roebourne was the capital), and of the Gascoyne district, were sheep farmers, were engaged in the same pursuits or occupations as ourselves, and their interests were identical with our own; and he certainly saw no

reason why these people should desire to separate themselves from this part of the colony. He did not ask in this resolution that any line of demarcation should be fixed, nor did he ask the House to affirm that a separate province should be formed out of any portion of our Northern territory. He thought that was altogether premature. The present population was so small, and the resources of that part of the colony so undeveloped—he might say unknown—that to attempt to fix any line of delimitation at present would be obviously absurd.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES said he thought it fair to the hon. member for Wellington to point out that if these resolutions were taken *seriatim*, in the way now proposed, and which of course was the most convenient mode of dealing with them, the hon. member's own resolutions could not be moved as an amendment upon these resolutions *en bloc*.

MR. RICHARDSON said that as a member representing a Northern district he felt it his duty to say a few words with reference to the resolution now before the committee, which particularly concerned that district. He quite agreed with the hon. member for Perth that it would be highly undesirable to fix a boundary, at this present juncture, at any particular line. We did not know what the future of these Northern districts might be. He thought it was highly probable that a few years hence the state of these districts would be very different from what it was now, and the nature of the industries of the population be very much changed. Although we might think that the right way to look at it now would be to fix the dividing line at the 26th parallel, so as to divide the pastoral from the agricultural industries at present existing, we must at the same time bear in mind that in the future other important industries may become developed,—neither pastoral nor agricultural. We might have a large mining population up there, and a population largely engaged in the cultivation of tropical produce and employing tropical labor. It was a natural conclusion to draw that the interests of a purely pastoral community and the interests of a mining community would be just as diverse, and more so, than the interests

of a pastoral community and of an agricultural community were at present; and he thought if a plebiscite of the residents of the whole country, right away from Northampton to the Roebourne district, were taken, with a view to the future dismemberment of the colony, it would be found they would prefer to be tacked on to the Southern portion of the colony, with its agricultural community, than to the more Northern portion, consisting of a mining community, and a community engaged in sugar growing and other tropical growths. There would be more community of feeling and identity of interests between them and the people of this part of the colony than could possibly exist between them and a purely mining population, amongst whom their voice would not be heard. There was a strong community of feeling already existing between the North and the South, and that desire for separation of which they once heard a good deal had very much died out. We in this part of the colony required their fat stock and meat, and, on the other hand, they required our cereals and our vegetable products; and, what could be more natural than that this interchange of their respective commodities should develop a community of interests between the North and South? But if in the future there should be, as they hoped, a large mining population settled in the more northern portions of our territory, and a community of planters employing colored labor, instead of there existing a community of feeling between a population so engaged and a population engaged in agricultural pursuits, the natural probability was their interests would be adverse. To attempt to define any political line of demarcation at this early stage of the development of the territory, which shall define where the colony is to be separated at some future day, would, he thought, be highly undesirable indeed; and he thought might very well be left to the future. The same trouble would arise if this line of separation were now fixed for the purpose of dealing with the proceeds of land sales or for apportioning the national debt. The probability was that hereafter the line would have to be shifted, and all our calculations would be upset, and endless complications arise.

MR. SHENTON said although per-

[*Responsible Govt.*

sonally not in favor of Responsible Government and representing a constituency the majority of which were still opposed to the change, still it appeared to him that the greater portion of the public being desirous of entering upon that form of Government, it would be neither wise nor beneficial to attempt to throw obstacles in the way. He thought it was their duty now, as patriotic citizens, to come forward and co-operate in obtaining for the colony the best constitution they could. The Constitution Bill would of course be referred to the country before it became law, and those who were then opposed to the contemplated change would have an opportunity of expressing their views, and of recording their votes in support of them. It might be that when this bill came to be referred to the constituencies, at the general election, the majority of members returned might be opposed to the provisions of the bill. But, at present, it appeared to him to be the duty of every member to do what he could to assist the Government in this matter. As to the proposed boundary line, personally he saw no necessity whatever, in the present circumstances of the colony, that there should be any separation at all, and he believed there was very little desire for it. He had reason to believe that the cry for separation arose from the action of the Government Resident at Roebourne in visiting the pearlers; he had every reason to believe that this gentleman was the prime mover in getting up the memorial that was sent home to the Secretary of State, by those engaged in the pearling industry, praying that, in the event of Responsible Government being granted, the North should be separated from the South. He believed it was this memorial that had weighed with the Secretary of State in suggesting the 26th parallel of latitude as the line of separation; for it would be seen, on reference to the map, that this boundary would include the pearling banks at Sharks Bay. When he was in England last time, in discussing this question of Responsible Government at the Colonial Office, he was then informed, and Governor Ord also informed him, that, if the colony came to be separated, the dividing line would be the natural scientific division, of the Tropic of Capricorn; and the reason why

the Colonial Office now suggested another dividing line was, he thought, in consequence of the agitation he had just referred to, and the pearlers' memorial, the prime instigator of which he had reason to believe was the Government Resident himself. No doubt the fairest division of the colony, whenever it took place, would be at the Tropic of Capricorn; although he thoroughly believed himself that at some future time, when the whole colony came to be populated, it would have to be divided into three distinct provinces, the Southern portion of the colony being better adapted for agricultural pursuits, the Central (or that portion situated between the 26th and the 19th parallel) being essentially a pastoral country, and the more Northern portion more fitted for tropical cultivation. But at the present time, in the present undeveloped state of these industries, and some of them practically untried, he thought they should endeavor to impress upon the Secretary of State that the colony should be kept one and undivided, until the population increased far more than it was at present; and that when the time came for a separation, at some future date, the most natural line of separation would be at the Tropic of Capricorn.

Mr. MARMION said he was generally in accord with what had fallen from those who had spoken on this subject, that it would be a mistake to indicate now the particular line where separation in the future should take place. No doubt, taking a reasonable and hopeful view of the future, we may naturally expect that great improvements will take place in the circumstances of the colony, that its varied resources will become developed, and that a large influx of people will take place into the more Northern portions of the colony. That being the case, possibly some years hence a cry may arise for separation; but, it seemed to him, there was no reason at all for indicating in the Constitution Bill where the line of separation should be fixed. To his mind, the desire for separation should emanate from the people who inhabited that particular part of the colony which wished to separate from this part. He thought it would be a mistake to attempt at the present time, when the colony was united, to declare a

line such as that proposed, and encourage the Northern people to ask for a larger slice of territory than we might be disposed to give them. It would tend to no good now nor hereafter. He had not the slightest doubt that the residents of the Ashburton and Gascoyne districts, and of what was known as the Nickol Bay country, and as far as the DeGrey and the boundary of the Kimberley District, would prefer to join this part of the colony rather than any new colony that might be started in the far North. It was well known that there was a great deal of the capital of people living in this Southern portion of the colony invested in developing the pastoral resources of those districts, and that people down here were largely interested in those parts of the colony. We also knew that there existed a bond of sympathy and a very kindly feeling between them and ourselves; and he believed himself, though this kindly feeling might be occasionally ruffled, it would always exist, and that our Northern friends would, so long as they were fairly treated by our future politicians, exhibit no desire to separate from us. Such being the case, why should we go out of our way now to indicate or suggest any particular line of demarcation? As he had already said, he thought it would be a mistake to do so, and that we ought to do our best to prevent it. The hon. member who had moved these resolutions, he was afraid, had framed them too much on the negative principle; he should have preferred to have seen a more positive stand taken. He thought this was rather a weak point in them, and one which was calculated to give rise to further controversy and procrastination, and the interchange of further despatches between the Secretary of State and ourselves. He thought that those who had decided that this constitutional change should take place—it was well known he had not been one of those who had sought to hasten it, but, having gone so far, he thought it was too late to retrace our steps—should do everything they could to expedite the settlement of the question, by every means in their power. That being the case, he thought it would be well not to be satisfied with any resolutions simply of a negative character, but indicate clearly to the Secretary of

State what in our opinion ought to be done and what ought not to be done. For instance, the latter part of the resolution now before them seemed to admit more or less that it might be necessary to indicate some line of demarcation, but not the particular line suggested by the Secretary of State. He thought it would be better to omit these words, and to confine ourselves to indicate that any line of separation at the present time would be premature and objectionable. He would suggest to the hon. member for Perth that all the words after the word "objection" be struck out. [MR. PARKER: Move to strike them out; I have no objection.] Then he would do so. He moved, as an amendment, that the words, "and that, in any case, the line suggested by the Secretary of State would be undesirable" be struck out. It might be deemed expedient hereafter to indicate to the Secretary of State our reason for coming to this conclusion, and he should be happy to render any assistance he could in framing those reasons. He thought it might be a mistake to be too curt in expressing our views to the Secretary of State, and that it would be as well perhaps to show him that we had good reason in support of these resolutions.

MR. VENN said he should like to say a few words in reply to what had fallen from his hon. friend the member for the North (Mr. Richardson) and from the hon. member who had just sat down. The tone of their remarks showed, after all, that when hon. members spoke fairly and openly, there was a great deal of unanimity of feeling amongst them on this question, whether representing Northern constituencies or Southern constituencies. It was a great pity this feeling was not more often preserved in that House. The hon. member for Perth, in introducing his resolutions, said he hoped hon. members would approach the consideration of this subject without resorting to personalities; but the hon. baronet, the member for Plantagenet, who immediately followed the hon. member, could not resist saying something which was personal with reference to himself (Mr. Venn) and the hon. member for Greenough, insinuating that they were desirous of putting this question of Responsible Government on a false footing, by bringing forward the resolutions standing

[*Responsible Govt.*

in their names; whereas, as a matter of fact, their only desire was to escape from their present false position, and to place themselves in a position that would be thoroughly understood by the House and the outside public. They had but one desire, and that was that this question should be approached in a conciliatory spirit, and brought to an issue as speedily as possible. Personally, he could have no other object in view; he had a large amount of property in the colony, and the interests of Western Australia were so bound up with his own pecuniary interests that he could have no other reason in the world for advocating any measure but that which would in his opinion contribute to her material prosperity. He felt sure the hon. member for Greenough was actuated by similar feelings, and that he had no desire to complicate the question or to put the movement back in any way. If hon. members would look at the resolutions of which he (Mr. Venn) had given notice they would see that he deprecated any delay in bringing this matter to an issue. In the very first of these resolutions hon. members were asked to affirm this. That resolution was as follows: "This Council having taken the two Despatches of the Secretary of State, dated 12th December, 1887, and the 3rd January, 1888, on the subject of constitutional change for Western Australia, into careful consideration, desire—(1.) To express their regret at the delay that has occurred on the part of the Government in submitting a Constitution Bill for Western Australia to their consideration, and would now press the urgent necessity for such a measure; and would further express an opinion that until the question of Responsible Government is finally settled in the form of a Constitutional Bill, the best interests of Western Australia are materially suffering, and financial questions paralysed." There was no doubt in his mind, nor, he thought, in the mind of any member, or in the mind of the public at large, that he was asking the House to affirm anything but what was an absolute fact when he asked it to pass that resolution. It might not be wise at all times to run against the Government, it might not be wise perhaps to run counter to the views expressed by such an authority as the

Secretary of State; but he thought it was always wise to express your opinion fearlessly, and, so long as you are a public man, to submit those views openly and unmistakably to the public.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES: I would remind the hon. member that the only question before the committee is the first resolution, relating to the question of separation. The hon. member is not speaking to it.

MR. VENN said he was simply endeavouring to explain his position, which had been assailed by the hon. baronet himself. Speaking to the resolution now before them, it appeared to him that if the words proposed to be omitted were left out, the resolution then would be substantially the same as one of his own, which was to the effect that in the Constitution Bill the provision for the ultimate division of the colony be the same as was granted to the colony of New South Wales. The proviso in the New South Wales Act was in these words: "Provided always that nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prevent Her Majesty from altering the boundary, on the North, in such manner as may seem fit." That left the question of defining the precise boundary line an open one, and he did not see why that could not be done here. He agreed with the hon. member for Fremantle when he said that the resolution now before them, as it now stood, was more in the nature of an invitation to argue the matter, than a positive expression of opinion. He did not think it would be wise to discuss this question of the future boundaries of the colony, at all, at the present time. When the question of separation was brought within the range of practical politics, the conditions and circumstances of the colony might be entirely different from what they were now, and a line of separation which might appear fair and reasonable now might then be altogether unsuitable. If the words proposed to be struck out were struck out, the resolution as amended would virtually be the same as his own, though he thought his own expressed a more decided opinion on the subject.

MR. HARPER said it appeared to him that the resolution in its present form, while on one hand submitting that it was premature at the present time to indicate any possible future boundary,

on the other hand it went on to contend that the boundary suggested by the Secretary of State was not where it ought to be—which was virtually an admission that some other boundary was necessary. He therefore agreed with the amendment, and thought it would be better to strike out the latter portion of the resolution. But he would suggest whether it would not be as well to state the reason why we considered it premature to fix the boundary at present, and, if the hon. member for Perth had no objection, he would move, as a further amendment, that the following words be added: “inasmuch as the future development of the colony may indicate that some other boundary would be desirable.” He thought, wherever the line of separation should be, its geographical position must be decided by the conditions of the colony at the time separation was about to take place. We did not know what the development of the country might be before then, or in what direction that development might take place; therefore it was impossible now to decide where the boundary line should be drawn. Looking at the question geographically he should say that the present boundary of the Kimberley District much more distinctly divided the natural characteristics of the country than any other line. He happened to have been a member of the committee which was appointed to report upon the most desirable boundaries for the Kimberley District, when it was first proclaimed; and the committee decided that, inasmuch as the country between the De Grey River and Roebuck Bay was to a great extent an unfertile country and suitable only for pastoral settlement, a boundary line running through that portion of the Northern territory would not divide any interests, so far as they knew; and from his experience of what was now called the North District, he had very little hope that tropical cultivation would be carried on there, in the future, to any extent. If there should be any, it must be farther North still.

MR. PARKER thought it would be inadvisable to add the words mentioned by the hon. member for York, or to give any reasons for these proposals. They were asked by the Secretary of State for their opinion as a Legislature upon certain points, and they were giving their

opinion upon those points, as briefly as they could. He did not know that they were asked to state their reasons for forming this opinion. He presumed the Secretary of State would be furnished with a copy of the report of the debates upon this question—he did not know whether anyone at the Colonial Office would read them; but no doubt His Excellency in his despatches would give them the effect of the reasons brought forward in the House in support of the resolutions arrived at.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MARMION (to strike out the latter portion of the clause) was agreed to, and the resolution as amended put and passed.

MR. PARKER then moved the second resolution, as follows: “(2.) That “special statutory reservation to Her Majesty’s Government in the Constitution Act of power to control legislation affecting Northern lands is unnecessary, the Crown having a right of veto upon all such legislation.” It had been suggested by the Secretary of State, —“That all the regulations affecting the “sale, letting, disposal, and occupation “of waste lands of the Crown in the “territory north of that line shall remain “under the control of Her Majesty’s “Government, the proceeds of all land “sales being invested at interest, to form “a fund, of which the principal would be “reserved for the benefit of any colony “or colonies which may hereafter be “created in such Northern territory, except in so far as it may from time to time be expended, with the sanction of “Her Majesty’s Government, for the “special advancement of the districts in “which it was raised, either by the settlement of emigrants therein, or in “other ways; while the interest of this “fund, as well as all rents and other “land revenue of an annual character, “not being instalments of money paid “under a system of conditional purchase, “would form part of the general revenue “and be subject to the vote of the Legislature of Western Australia.” The resolution which he now proposed, and also the next one, dealt with the suggestion of the Secretary of State. They knew that under the Land Regulations as they stood, and approved only recently by the Secretary of State himself, there

[*Responsible Govt.*

was virtually no sale of Crown lands in our Northern territory. The regulations did not contemplate any alienation of these lands except in townships or within special areas. They provided that the land should be leased, but not alienated; and the Secretary of State did not propose to deprive us of the rents received from leases. Therefore under the existing regulations, which had been sanctioned by the Home Government, there would be no revenue worth speaking about to accrue from the sale of these Northern lands, and no fund to be set apart for the benefit of any future colony which may hereafter be created in that part of the colony. That being so, there was no necessity for making any special statutory reservation with regard to these lands. Such a provision, if made, would be simply a dead letter. No doubt the Secretary of State had considered it necessary to make this suggestion, because he had observed from the return furnished to him that there had been a considerable amount derived from land sales during the year which that return referred to. But, as hon. members were aware, that was an exceptional year, and the revenue from that source was abnormally large, by reason of the sale of town lots at Derby and Wyndham, when there was a great rush, in consequence of the alleged discovery of gold. These town lots at the time fetched very high prices: there was quite a land "boom." But he did not think it was likely that there would be much derived from the sale of town lots up there, in the future,—or at any rate for many years to come. With regard to the special legislation referred to by the Secretary of State, as regards these Northern lands, he had already pointed out that the Crown now had a right to veto any regulation passed by this House for the disposal of waste lands, and the Crown always would have this right of veto. No doubt it would be only right and proper, if the Colonial Office found that the local Legislature at Perth was dealing improperly or unfairly with these Northern lands, that it should exercise its right of vetoing such legislation. That right is already possessed, and, such being the case, it appeared to him it would be quite unnecessary to have any special legislation with regard to these

waste lands at the North. In fact it would be most undesirable, so long as the colony remained one and undivided, that there should be two different systems of dealing with the lands of the colony. The same might be said with regard to the proposed arrangement for funding the proceeds of these Northern lands, with a view to their future use for local purposes. Such an arrangement would only lead to needless complication, and, looking at the insignificant amount of revenue likely to be received, altogether unnecessarily so.

Mr. VENN moved, as an amendment, a resolution standing in his own name—"That the usual provisions for vesting "the control and disposal of the waste "lands of the colony be granted to the "Legislature." He proposed that a provision to this effect should be incorporated in the Constitution Bill. He thought the hon. member for Perth in advocating his own resolution (that now before the committee) had advocated the cause of his (Mr. Venn's) resolution, in far better words than he could do so. It appeared to him the hon. member's resolution was only a negative or argumentative way of putting the question, which was calculated to invite discussion; whereas, if they put the proposition in the words which he had suggested, it would convey clearly what the Legislature meant to convey. He would only add that the power of veto possessed by the Crown under our present constitution as a Crown colony was altogether different from the power of veto under Responsible Government.

Mr. RANDELL wished to know whether the hon. member intended to deprive the Crown of this right of veto? It would appear from the hon. member's amendment that the whole control and disposal of the waste lands of the colony was to be vested in the local Legislature, without any right of veto on the part of the Crown. Was the Imperial Government likely to assent to that? He would ask the hon. member for Perth whether he thought the resolution now before the committee and also the next one were necessary? Did it not follow that having passed the first resolution, deprecating any political sub-division of the colony, these resolutions relating to the disposal of lands only in the event

of such sub-division were superfluous? Were they not involved in the first proposition? Why should they discuss the question of the disposal of these Northern lands, if it was not proposed to divide the colony? Of course if the Legislature carried its point, and obtained self-governing powers over the whole colony, one and undivided, there would be no necessity for any special statutory reservation, giving Her Majesty's Government power to control agrarian legislation affecting any portion of the colony more than another. He thought no valid reasons could be assigned at the present moment why legislation dealing with the lands of the colony should not be left to the colonial Legislature,—subject to the veto of the Crown as at present, and, as he believed, was the case in the other colonies, though perhaps in their case this right of veto was scarcely ever exercised. Perhaps the Secretary of State was animated solely by a desire to prevent any conflict hereafter with the local Legislature. There could be no objection on the part of the House to affirm the principle involved in the resolution now before it, but it appeared to him unnecessary, after affirming the first and main resolution.

MR. PARKER said there was a great deal in what the hon. member, Mr. Randell, had said; but, it would be seen that the Secretary of State had labored this question, and submitted three consecutive propositions, marked (a), (b), and (c), in his despatch; and these resolutions were intended to reply to those propositions categorically. It would have appeared rather curt to have only replied to one of these propositions, leaving the others unanswered, and he thought it would be more courteous towards the Secretary of State to reply to his objections *seriatim*. With regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington, substituting one of the hon. member's propositions for the one now before the committee, he would point out to the hon. member that these resolutions were intended in answer to the Secretary of State's despatch, asking for the views of the Legislature on certain points or suggestions with reference to the conditions upon which Responsible Government should be granted. To answer the Secretary of State's sug-

{ *Responsible Govt.*

gestions and propositions with reference to the control of Crown lands by curtly stating "that the usual provisions for vesting the control and disposal of the waste lands of the Crown be granted to the Legislature," would hardly be a courteous way of replying to his objections. Moreover the hon. member's amendment was not in the form of a reply to the Secretary of State's despatch at all, but one of the provisions which the hon. member wished to see incorporated in the Constitution Bill. They were not now dealing with the Constitution Bill but with the Secretary of State's despatches. He would also point out that since these despatches were written, the Under Secretary of State had distinctly promised the House of Commons, in reply to a question, that it was not intended to give us the control of our Northern lands; and the resolutions now before the committee were framed to meet that promise or pledge, and to show that there was no necessity for special legislation on the subject, the Crown already having the right of veto. Such being the case, and the hon. member's amendment being more in the nature of an instruction for the framing of a Constitution Bill, he hoped the hon. member would not deem it necessary to press it.

MR. RICHARDSON said he must say he was quite in accord both with the spirit and the wording of the resolution. The Secretary of State had called upon them to answer certain objections which had suggested themselves to him, and it would be discourteous, to say the least of it, to reply to these objections in the curt and abrupt manner suggested by the hon. member for Wellington.

MR. HENSMAN thought it would be rather a work of supererogation to remind the Crown that it had the right of veto. Was it proposed to suggest that in this colony the Crown should have a greater right of veto than it possessed as regards other self-governing colonies? If so—if it meant that we were prepared to submit to an unlimited right of veto—it would be tantamount to saying that we were not unwilling to abandon the control of these lands to the Home Government.

The amendment, upon being put, was negatived, and the original resolution affirmed, *nem. con.*

MR. PARKER then moved the 3rd resolution, namely: "That the proposed arrangement for funding the proceeds of Northern lands, with a view to their future local use, would be a needless complication, the Regulations lately sanctioned by the Secretary of State not contemplating alienation of those lands except in townships and in special areas." He had already, he said, in speaking to the previous resolution dealt with this subject, and the resolution virtually explained itself. It was therefore needless for him to say any more, as he felt sure it would commend itself to the House.

MR. A. FORREST said he should support this resolution, for he thought it was only fair and just—although he represented a Northern district—that the Legislature here ought to receive all the revenue derived from the disposal of lands at the North, seeing the large sums we had expended in the development of that part of the colony, and looking at the small amount of revenue likely to be derived from these Northern lands. We were spending thousands of pounds every year in this portion of the colony in public works, and at the present moment were incurring an expenditure of £60,000 in providing it with a telegraph line. It was possible that some day a considerable amount might be derived from the sale of town lands, when new townsites came to be declared; but we should have to expend large sums in providing wharves, jetties, tramways, and other improvements in these townsites, as we had already done at Derby and Wyndham. He thought the resolution would meet with the support of every member—even Northern members, for he thought it was only fair and reasonable that after the expenditure out of general revenue that had been going on for years in Northern Districts, and the small amount likely to be received from the sale of lands, that this amount should continue to go to the general revenue.

MR. MARMION was afraid—knowing the views of the Colonial Office on this subject, as expressed through successive Secretaries of State, as to the desirability of keeping a separate account of the revenue derived from these Northern Districts and of funding the proceeds of

these land sales—that we should find some difficulty in this matter. It had struck him, however, that this proposed funding of Northern revenues would operate as a direct deterrent as regards the Government doing what they could to develop our Northern Districts. What had been our object in expending the large amounts we had expended in these districts in surveys and public works? Was it not the encouragement of settlement, in the hope of our deriving some ulterior return or profit? If you took away that incentive you took away all spirit of enterprise and all chance of the development of the country. No one could say that up to the present time the Northern portion of our territory had not received fair consideration at the hands of that House, and its full proportion of public expenditure. Kimberley at any rate had been most liberally treated in this respect. If the revenue, small or great, derived from the waste lands of the district was going to be funded and set apart for the benefit of some future colony it appeared to him it would be a direct invitation to that House to spend no more money in the district, and, at the same time, offering a sort of bonus to the Kimberley people to ask for separation. It appeared to him that those who would suffer by the proposed arrangement, as suggested by the Secretary of State, were the Northern people themselves, for, until they had a Government and a Legislature of their own, some time in the distant future, it was not likely that the Legislature down here would be disposed to incur any large expenditure in the district, if the territorial revenue from sales was going to be funded, and invested at interest, for the benefit of any colony or colonies that may hereafter be created in that part of the colony. As the Colonial Office appeared to entertain a somewhat strong opinion on this subject, he did not know whether it was worth while combatting it, and thereby possibly causing further delay in the settlement of the constitutional question,—especially bearing in mind that meanwhile we were to receive and have the use of the rents accruing from all leased lands. He felt somewhat inclined to ask the Home Government to reconsider this subject, rather than we should take any definite stand upon it at the present moment.

MR. RICHARDSON said this resolution probably affected the interests of the North more than any other of these resolutions. It would be agreed in all quarters that the North had a right to expect some substantial protection or guarantee that the funds derived from its lands shall be devoted to further the interests of the district, under the proposed new constitution; and it was his duty, as a representative of the North, to see that this protection was afforded to it. It was argued that the present Land Regulations did not admit of the alienation of lands at the North; but these regulations were not going to last for ever; and he believed there was a provision even in the present regulations for setting apart special areas, within which waste land could be sold or alienated. Therefore he felt it was incumbent upon him to see that the Northern people were protected, and he thought he could see sufficient protection against any unfair dealing with their revenue, or any unfair treatment, in the fact that the Constitution Bill would contain a clause giving them the right to separate and form themselves into an independent colony. He thought this was sufficient moral protection against any unjust treatment of the North by the Legislature down here. But, he thought, so long as the Northern districts were properly represented, there never would be any great opposition in that House to give them their fair share of public expenditure. If he thought otherwise, he should oppose this resolution to the very last. At the same time, he considered, come what may, that the North had sufficient moral protection in the fact that the Constitutional Act would give the people the right of secession, in the event of their wants being neglected, or their revenue unfairly administered. That being so, he did not intend to oppose this resolution. At the same time, he should like to say that he thought it was very desirable that the funds derived from the sale and alienation of Crown Lands all over the colony should be passed to capital account, and be expended in reproductive public works, instead of forming part of the general revenue.

MR. PARKER said the hon. member for Fremantle had suggested that we might give way to the Colonial Office

[*Responsible Govt.*

upon this matter of funding the proceeds of Northern lands. But he would point out to the hon. member that if we were to give way on this point, it meant that we must define the boundary line; and he thought they all considered it would be highly undesirable to do that, at the present time, for to define a line of separation would mean at once that we looked forward to separation at a very early date, whereas, in fact, we strongly deprecated it.

The resolution was then put and passed *nem. con.*

MR. PARKER said the next resolution, it would be observed, referred to the question of whether we should have one or two Legislative Chambers; and, as the hon. member for Greenough, who, he believed, was very much interested in this question, was not that evening in that perfect form which they usually saw him in, he would move, in order to give the hon. member another opportunity of discussing the subject, that they should now report progress, and sit again on Wednesday next (March 28th).

Agreed to.

Progress reported.

Wednesday, 28th March, 1888.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT: MR.
PARKER'S RESOLUTIONS.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

On the order of the day for going into committee for the further consideration of the resolutions submitted by Mr. Parker, with reference to Responsible Government,

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said it was only by leave and the indulgence of the House that he was able to address himself to the important resolutions which were now to be considered in committee. He hoped the House would not consider him presumptuous.