

the matter; and the reason he had got up was to endeavor to enlighten the House, from his own experience, as to the actual state of affairs. If pearling nowadays was such a very unprofitable business, he hardly thought these people would have made so much fuss about it, and moved heaven and earth to get what they wanted. If they found they could not prosecute the industry here at a profit, why did they remain? Why didn't they clear out, and go elsewhere, if they thought they would be better treated, or do better? The hon. member for Kimberley had quoted some telegrams he had received in support of his motion. He (Mr. Sholl) had also sent a telegram to the North, when he saw this notice of motion, to inquire whether there was a general feeling in the district that the duty ought to be reduced: and the reply which he received was that the settlers generally did not require or wish for this concession. There was another matter which he thought ought to be considered in dealing with these what he might call "foreign" vessels, and that was the Malay crews they employed. A very dangerous and undesirable element was occasionally turned loose at Cossack from these vessels, as was shown by the recent shocking murder committed there; and it would soon become a question of whether we shall not have to increase the police force in this district. For his own part he was entirely opposed to the resolution. He did not see why these people should be put on a different footing from that on which our own people had been put for years past, and which they had borne without a murmur. We must keep a Revenue Vessel there, and the cost of that vessel was increasing. He thought, in the present state of the country's finances, this was a very bad time to bring this matter forward.

MR. BURT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Agreed to.

Debate adjourned.

The House adjourned at a quarter to eleven o'clock, p.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Monday, 19th November, 1888.

Non-Alienation by Trustees Bill: first reading—Life Assurance Companies Bill: first reading—Goldfields Licensing Bill: first reading—Fortification of King George's Sound: Conference of Delegates at Albany—Financial Statement: Estimates 1889—Protection of Kimberley settlers from native attacks and depredations—Scab Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Closure of streets (Albany) under Railways Act: adjourned debate—Reduction of Duty on Pearl-shells: adjourned debate—Patents Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

The following bills were read a first time: Non-Alienation by Trustees Bill; Life Assurance Companies Bill; and Goldfields Licensing Bill.

FORTIFICATION OF KING GEORGE'S SOUND: PROPOSED CONFERENCE AT ALBANY.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL: Sir—The motion I have to bring before the House now is one that I have no doubt will receive the immediate approval of members. I was pleased to see in the reports of a meeting that took place a few nights ago, near where we now are, the Governor—speaking of the good augury of the visit made to the colony by two distinguished Prelates of our national and historical churches, and of the good likely to accrue to the colony from such visits—went on to say that he was not without hope that before long it might be possible to arrange an intercolonial Conference of some of the leading Australian statesmen, upon the subject of the military defence of King George's Sound. Seeing these remarks of His Excellency the Governor, I feel satisfied that my resolution will meet with the approval of the Executive bench. I believe, with the Governor, that a visit to this colony of Australian statesmen of position, if we can induce them to come and to confer with our Government and leading public men, will have a very good effect upon the welfare of the colony at large. I do not wish to take any credit myself that is not my due in bringing forward this matter, and I hasten to inform the

House that the suggestion upon which this resolution of mine is framed came to me from my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and he will tell you that the idea originated with Sir James Lorimer, the Defence Minister of Victoria, who recently told him that if our Government and Legislature agreed, he would do all in his power to further the proposal. I think, sir, this is a fitting opportunity to take in connection with this matter, to pay a tribute to our own delegates at the Colonial Conference held in London a short time ago. I am sure anyone who reads these bulky reports of the proceedings of the Conference will see how well we were represented there by Mr. Forrest and Mr. Burt, who evidently took their places amongst the foremost Australian statesmen of the day with credit to themselves and to the colony, thoroughly upholding our honor and our interests. It is encouraging to observe what a great deal of interest was taken by that Conference in this question of the fortification of King George's Sound, and the consensus of opinion that it was likely to become a place of strategic importance and a great naval coaling station in the future. In this connection, perhaps my hon. friend, the hon. member for Fremantle, will kindly pardon me if I refer to one or two little words that fell from him the other night when speaking of the starting point of the transcontinental railway, I think. The hon. member referred to Albany as a "little fishing village." That is not the light in which it is regarded, evidently, by the representative statesmen who attended this Imperial-Colonial Conference. If I may be allowed I would refer the hon. member to what Sir William Fitzherbert said on that occasion. "I myself believe," he said,—“without wishing to give offence to the other great centres in Australia—that Albany, in no distant future, will be equal in importance to any other Australian capital; and I am fortified in that opinion by other persons much more competent to form an opinion than myself.” I wish to say this to my hon. friend the member for Fremantle—it is not worthy of him to show this paltry feeling whenever the question of Albany comes up. The hon. member was not in the House the other night, I think, when

I spoke on another subject affecting the interests of the town of Albany—I refer to the route or starting point of the railway to Eucla—when I said that although there was a strong local feeling in favor of making Albany the terminus of that line, I hoped that I knew my duty to the colony as well as my duty to my constituents. I do not think I have in the past given the hon. member any ground whatever for these depreciatory remarks,—remarks which are unworthy of him, and which can do no possible good. They only give rise to a feeling of antagonism which had better be left alone, and, so far as my constituents are concerned, these foolish little attacks excite a feeling that they are regarded here as outsiders, and that their interests are held to be antagonistic to the interests of this part of the colony. I have always told them such was really not the case, and that I could always obtain justice for them, and that when it came to the point members were generally willing to treat them fairly. But I must say that when hon. members make slighting remarks such as that I have referred to, it does not make my task easy, and it gives a handle to agitators to foment this feeling of antagonism between one part of the colony and the other, which I think we should deprecate. Coming back to the resolution, hon. members who have read these papers will see the difficulties which our delegates at the Colonial Conference had to contend with in trying to arrange a basis for dealing with this question of the fortification of King George's Sound. Of course we all know that the question of the auxiliary fleet was very easily settled, the contributions being on the basis of population; but, when it came to the question of fortifications at Albany difficulties arose, some of which had not been foreseen. The Imperial Government, it appears, considered that our land defence was not a matter of Imperial concern, and that it ought to be undertaken by the Australian colonies themselves. On the other hand, our neighbors, while fully admitting right through that the fortification of King George's Sound was a matter of intercolonial concern—their affair as well as ours—also considered that it was a matter of Imperial concern; and that the Imperial Government should be

bound to contribute towards the construction of the works. The Imperial authorities, however, declined to take that view, any further than agreeing to provide the necessary armament; and the consequence was that our delegates found there would be a difficulty in arriving at any mutual arrangement unless they took some active steps in the matter. Consequently, having consulted their Government here, they submitted a proposition to the Conference that this colony should contribute £5,000 as its share towards the construction of the defence works at Albany, and £1,500 a year—or about one-fourth of the total estimated cost—towards the upkeep of these works, the other colonies contributing £4,500 between them. Upon this liberal and spirited offer the Home Government agreed to give us some improved armament of a more modern type; and there the matter now rests. The question of the construction of the works—how they are to be carried out—is still to be definitely settled, and I cannot help thinking that the most likely way of arriving at a settlement would be to have this Conference that I now propose. Members will see that in this resolution I do not ask them to express any opinion as to the basis of this arrangement—that is not my business, but the business of the Government; but I should like to make one or two observations on this point. Every other colony but Queensland—where there has been a change of Government, the Ministry now in power taking a Nationalist or what might be more properly regarded as a Separatist view of the question—every other Australian colony but Queensland hastened to confirm the action of our delegates at the Conference, and considered it a point of honor to do so. My own view is, that considering how anxious our delegates were to act in the best interests of their colony, we should be doing them an injustice, and ourselves an injustice, if we refused to confirm the offer which they made. However, I do not ask the House in this resolution to say anything about that; it is a matter for the Government to deal with. But I will say this: I consider that the moderate amount we are asked to contribute—I say moderate, because although more than it would come to calculated

on the basis of population, it is otherwise moderate—I consider the amount which our delegates provisionally pledged us to contribute towards the fortification of this great coaling station we possess at King George's Sound will be money well invested in the interests of the colony. Many hon. members perhaps are not aware of the large profit, of the largely increasing revenue, which the colony now derives from the shipping at Albany—a revenue which of course would be enormously increased in the event of the place becoming an important naval coaling station. Even as it is, I suppose the revenue of the port has doubled since the time this Conference was held, large steamers calling there regularly now, which did not call there then; and we are now deriving some £20,000 a year from Customs alone, apart from the large amounts received in respect of harbor dues and other indirect sources of revenue. I am sure that if by contributing the sum which I have mentioned towards the fortification of the place we can induce the other colonies to join with us in the construction of these defence works, the importance of Albany as a coaling station will be vastly increased, and our profits correspondingly increased. The House will see on reference to my resolution that I do not specify any time when the Government should take action in this matter; all I ask is that they shall do it, as soon as they are in a position to do so. At present, although it is believed that the Imperial Government have obtained the necessary Parliamentary vote for the improved armament which the Home Government has promised, I understand our Government here have not yet received a despatch on the subject, and they think themselves precluded from taking any decided or practical step in the matter until they receive that despatch. However, I do not think that is of any consequence at present, for I do not think it would be desirable to hold this Conference until the railway between here and Albany is completed; and, if I may be allowed to do so, I would suggest that the meeting of delegates should, if possible, be so arranged that it might be held on the occasion of the opening of that line. Both Albany and Perth will be, to a certain extent, in holiday array

at that time, and the impression created upon our visitors may perhaps be more gratifying than it would at any other time. Of course, when the work they had to do in connection with the question of fortification had been concluded, we should hope to receive the delegates in Perth, and our Government and leading men might confer with them on such questions as the transcontinental railway and various other matters of intercolonial interest. I feel certain that members will agree with me that a visit of this kind from leading statesmen of the other colonies would be calculated to do us a great deal of good,—practical good and sentimental good; practical good, inasmuch that we would be able by this intercourse to discuss and arrange various matters of intercolonial and mutual concern; and of sentimental good, inasmuch that it would bring us into closer sympathy with the other colonies at a time when we are seeking to enter more closely into the comity of a general Australian nationalism, by adopting a system of Government similar to that of our neighbors. For these reasons, sir, I feel sure that the resolution I am about to make will commend itself to the approval of members generally. It is: "That in the opinion of this House it would be desirable that the Government—so soon as they are placed in a position to do so—should consider the advisability of inviting a Conference of Delegates from the Australasian Colonies to assemble at King George's Sound, with a view of arriving at some practical settlement of the questions still pending respecting the fortification of that locality."

MR. RANDELL presumed the hon. member would be prepared to vote a considerable sum of money to meet the expense of this Conference. These visitors would have to be entertained, when they came here, and he should imagine we should require a vote of about £1,000 for that purpose. [THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not at all.] He presumed the Government would be inclined to act towards these visitors in a way that would bring no discredit at any rate upon the colony and its hospitality, and would take care to obtain a vote that would enable them to do so. He did not at all rise to oppose the motion, but to remind the House that it would pro-

bably involve a considerable amount of expense. He could not say that he had any great sympathy with the proposal himself, for reasons which he need not detain the House now to enter upon, and his only object in rising was to point out that if the resolution were carried, and this Conference were held, it would entail the necessity of voting a considerable sum of money.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser): What for?

MR. RANDELL: Entertainments of various kinds. I take it we would have to entertain these distinguished visitors, in a way becoming with their position as our invited guests.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser): Not out of public funds.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest): I cannot agree with the last speaker as to the necessity for any large expenditure of money to carry out the object of this resolution. We have sent delegates from this colony on various occasions to the other colonies, and I am not aware that it has cost the colony much, or that the other colonies have been put to any great expense in entertaining them. I do not suppose it will cost us sixpence out of public funds to entertain these visitors. They will come here delegated by their own colonies, and any expense connected with their mission will be borne by those colonies. There are persons in this colony public spirited enough to undertake the duties of delegates without expectation of payment or reward; and I suppose there are such men to be found in the other colonies as well as this. No doubt we should be only too glad to treat them with every hospitality, and to show them our appreciation of their visit; but I cannot see that it would entail any expenditure of public money. I had not intended speaking to the motion, and I would not have risen but for what fell from the hon. member I have referred to—though I am very much interested in the proposal. I believe it would do us a great deal of good, and tend to bring us into closer union with our Eastern neighbors. As the hon. baronet said, the suggestion originated with the Minister of Defence for Victoria, Sir James Lorimer, who informed me he thought he was sure to get the other colonies to agree to it, and

that he could certainly speak for Victoria sending a delegate. I believe, possibly, Sir James Lorimer would himself come, if his Ministry happened to be in power at the time. I also believe the other colonies would send their delegates. They all recognise the importance of King George's Sound, as the key of any effective defence of the Australian continent. If hon. members have read this large volume containing the proceedings of the late Conference in England, they will see that a considerable amount of attention and discussion was given to the subject of the fortification of the Sound, at that Conference, at which my hon. and learned friend the member for the North and myself had the honor to represent this colony. In fact, the very last words of the sessions of the Conference were devoted to this question. Wishing to be perfectly clear as to the intention of the Imperial Government in the matter, I said to the President: "Before we separate, I should like to know whether I correctly understood the statement that you, sir, made the other day with reference to King George's Sound to mean that if the Imperial Government supplied the improved armament, and Western Australia undertook that portion of the expenditure put forward in the paper by my colleague and myself, the other colonies then would contribute the remainder? Did I correctly understand that that was finally settled, and that it was contingent upon the Imperial Government providing this improved armament?" To this Sir Henry Holland replied: "I can only say that, as President sitting here, I rather understood that, subject to the decisions of the Colonial Governments, the delegates individually thought that the offer of Western Australia was a fair one, and were prepared to accede to it. But, of course, they could only give their own individual opinions; I give you my opinion as President." To which I replied: "If that is so, I am satisfied." Sir William Fitzherbert said: "That was our view;" and Sir Robert Wisdom added: "That was the general opinion." I then remarked: "Then the only thing is that it is contingent upon the decision of the Imperial Government that they will supply the improved armament?" To which the President said: "Yes; I understood that

that proposition depended upon the Imperial Government finding the new type of guns." Hon. members will therefore see that this question of the fortification of King George's Sound occupied a very prominent part in the discussions of the Colonial Conference; and the very last words spoken among the delegates—except those that were complimentary to the President and the other officials, had reference to that subject; and I believe myself that the whole of the colonies are very anxious to come to some arrangement with reference to this important matter. It appears to me that one of the very best ways of accomplishing what we want is to have a meeting of delegates representing the Governments of those colonies, as suggested by the hon. baronet in this resolution.

MR. SHOLL: I think, sir, whether it is a question of expense or not—even if it cost the colony a few thousands—it would be very desirable to arrange this Conference, and I believe the money would be well spent. I agree with the mover of the resolution that the mere presence of some of the leading men of the other colonies, assembling at Albany, for this purpose, would do Western Australia good. At the same time I think the hon. member, Mr. Randell, spoke to the point when he reminded the House that such a meeting was likely to cost the colony some money. Of course we do not know what these Conferences may cost the other colonies, in which they are held. Under another form of Government, they do not make it known to the world what these affairs cost. I do not think they are as particular about such expenditure as under our present form of Government. I think if we invite these delegates to visit us, the Government should be prepared with funds to properly entertain them. With regard to the cost of these fortifications, I think our delegates were pretty liberal when they offered £5,000 as the share of this colony. But this is a question which the Conference will deal with, and which we shall have to deal with in the future.

MR. MARMION: It is not my intention, sir, to go into the question of the cost of entertaining these delegates: I regard that as rather a paltry consideration in a matter of this kind. I think

what we have to consider now is what are likely to be the practical results of adopting this resolution. Of course if the desire is to invite a certain number of the leading statesmen of the other colonies to come round here for a picnic, for the purpose of seeing the country and viewing the richness of the land, by all means let us put something on the Estimates for that purpose, and let us understand what we are about. But do not let us ask them to visit us, under a false pretence. I think it is all nonsense to ask a number of politicians to come here who know nothing practically about this question of defence. They may be very good politicians, but they are not military experts. We have already had a report and an estimate of the works required, from two distinguished British officers, of the military and of the naval service; and I am sure these delegates from the other colonies will not be able to throw any more light upon the subject from a practical point of view. It seems to me there is nothing practical about this resolution. It is a resolution which, in all probability, may be productive of good, so far as affording a means of intercourse with representative men from the neighboring colonies, but, so far as the question of defence is concerned, I see no good object in having a Conference of gentlemen who probably know nothing about such matters. I am not now going into the question of the importance of Albany as a coaling station and a strategic military position, or as a place of shelter for the Navy in time of war—no one can dispute that. When I referred to it the other evening as a "fishing village," I was only speaking of it relatively, as compared with the commercial importance of the port of Fremantle. If the hon. baronet had suggested a Conference of military experts, to deal practically with this question of fortification, some good might come out of it; but he must know as well as I do that these gentlemen whom it is proposed to invite can tell us nothing on that subject that we have not already been told. [The COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: We don't want it.] What do we want them for? [The COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: To arrange the question of sharing the cost.] I think that would be a task for delegates at a general Conference of all the colonies. [The Com-

MISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: We hope to have delegates from all the colonies here.] I do not approach this question in a hostile spirit at all; only it strikes me that no practical results can possibly come out of it; and I am rather inclined to think that this question of consulting as to armaments and fortifications is simply a cloak for inviting these gentlemen to a pleasant picnic, and a few weeks' outing, and for catching a few votes in support of the resolution, rather than with any serious eye to business.

MR. KEANE: The hon. member for Fremantle seems to me to have wandered rather off the track. The question of armament and fortification works was settled by the Conference in London, and the question which the hon. member for Plantagenet has in mind, I take it, is the question of how the cost of these works is to be divided between the various colonies, which has not yet been settled; and I think it would be a capital thing for this colony if we had it settled, satisfactorily. I, for one, would be quite prepared to vote a sum of money for such a Conference. I think it would be a very good thing for this colony if we had more visits from the leading men of the other colonies, who would probably sharpen us up a bit. I think we have been isolated from them long enough, and the more intercourse we have with our progressive and go-ahead neighbors the more likely we are to go ahead ourselves. I think £1,000 or £2,000 spent in this way would be money well spent.

MR. PARKER: When I first saw this notice of motion it struck me that it was a somewhat ambitious one. I thought we might invite these delegates, as we might call spirits from the vasty deep, but—would they come? I cannot help thinking if Western Australia has the honor of entertaining a Conference of delegates, representing the Governments of all the other Australian colonies, we shall have made an immense step in advance, and we shall show the world what we have not been able to show it yet, that Western Australia has at last been able to take up that position among her sister colonies which those colonies have in turn assumed, when they have invited to their shores a Conference of the leading Australian statesmen. What-

ever may be the result of this proposal, so far as the other colonies are concerned, I cannot help thinking it would be one of the grandest advertisements that Western Australia ever had. The hon. member for Fremantle objects to the resolution because, he says, it cannot lead to any practical result, and suggests that we should have a Conference of military experts. I thought the military aspect of the question had all been settled—it appears so from the proceedings of the Imperial Conference. We have had plans and specifications, and everything laid down as to the best mode and manner in which Albany should be fortified, and the only question now is, how the cost of these works is to be defrayed? I should imagine that was a very practical question. I imagine that even the hon. member himself would consider it a good thing if we could induce the Governments of all the other colonies to share this cost, especially if they were prepared to do so on the basis of population. I would ask the hon. member how we are likely to arrive at any practical solution of that question unless it is by means of a Conference of this kind, at which each colony will have its accredited representative? It appears to me that if anything practical is ever going to come of this question of fortifying King George's Sound this is how it must be arrived at, by having a meeting of delegates to discuss this one subject, with a view to a mutual settlement. And what place can there be more fitting for holding such a Conference than Albany itself? I do not think the hon. member for Plantagenet need fear that Albany will not have full justice done to it by this House, as a magnificent harbor, a valuable naval coaling station, and the key of Australian defence. No one can rob her of those claims, and no one here wishes to do so. It would be useless for us to dream that any attacks made by any member of this House upon Albany will ever detract from its position in this respect. I need hardly say that I have very great pleasure in supporting the resolution; I shall consider it a very great honor indeed if these representative men from the other colonies, deputed by their respective Governments, may be induced to come here to discuss this question, on the spot. The hon. member for Fremantle asks, what

do these gentlemen know about defences or fortifications? I understand the idea of this Conference originated with Sir James Lorimer, the Defence Minister of Victoria, who, I believe, is a considerable authority on the subject of fortifications. I believe this is the gentleman who suggested to the Imperial Government that the Thames was not adequately fortified, and pointed out that hostile vessels might steal up that river and bombard the city of London itself. [MR. MARMION: You could have done that.] Therefore, if Sir James Lorimer did us the honor of being one of these delegates we would have one at least among them who might be able to give us some practical information that would satisfy the hon. member for Fremantle himself.

MR. RICHARDSON: To my mind the only really practical question we have to consider is whether the delegates would consent to come, if we invited them. If they do, then I think we shall have attained one very good practical result. There is nothing like a demonstration, for bringing public attention to bear upon a subject like this. Personal intercourse will do infinitely more than acres of correspondence. Two hours personal conversation among delegates empowered to act will do more to settle this question than volumes of official correspondence. I think if we can only induce these representative and responsible statesmen to seriously entertain the project, and to come amongst us, it will be a good step towards a practical solution of the financial difficulties surrounding this question. On the other hand, if they do not come, no great harm will ensue from the resolution.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL: I will only detain the House a minute, while I reply to one or two remarks. I should, myself, have considered it was a very ambitious resolution, this resolution of mine, and should have doubted whether it was at all likely we could have got delegates to come here, were it not (as I have said) that the proposition originally emanated from Sir James Lorimer. I hoped my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands would have mentioned to the House a little more in detail the conversation he had with Sir James Lorimer on the subject; but I think I sufficiently recollect what my hon. friend

told me of that conversation. I think he said it was at Government House that Sir James, who had attended the Conference in London, asked him how we proposed to arrange for a practical settlement of the question of expense in connection with the fortification of King George's Sound, the general scientific details of which had been arranged at the Imperial Conference; and I understood my hon. friend to have replied that he did not know what we intended doing in the matter, and that Sir James Lorimer suggested we should try and get a Conference, and said if we did so he could promise us that we should get the hearty support of his own colony in the proposal—and hon. members are aware what great influence Victoria exercises amongst the other colonies. No doubt if Sir James Lorimer and the Victorian Government exercise their influence, as Sir James promised to do, there can be very little doubt that this Conference will assemble. With regard to there being nothing practical about the resolution, I do not really understand what the hon. member for Fremantle means. He must know that the military details of the scheme were settled long ago by the Conference held in London, and the only question now to be settled is the very practical question of who is to pay. What proportion of the cost shall this colony pay, and what will be the proportion which the other colonies are prepared to pay. All these questions have to be considered, and I should imagine they are about the most practical questions in the world, and I do not know what better way of dealing with them we could have than this Conference. I am very glad to find that my resolution has met with such very general support.

Motion put and passed.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL moved that the resolution be presented to His Excellency the Governor by humble address.

Agreed to.

ESTIMATES FOR 1889.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser), having moved the House into committee of ways and means, said: Considering the fact, Sir Thomas Campbell, that this is the third occasion within

the past twelve months that I have addressed this House on the question of Estimates and questions of finance, namely, on the 28th December, the 14th of March, and on the present occasion, it cannot be taken to be desirable that I should travel again over the old ground. If hon. members will refer to the reports of the proceedings in our *Hansard*, they will find that, in dealing with the Estimates for the current year, I spoke then on the condition of trade, the progress of settlement in the colony, the general improvements both in the town and in the country districts, the gold discoveries, immigration, the colonial indebtedness, the Revenue, viewing it generally from all sources, the Expenditure, and other matters. Therefore, it appears to me, on the present occasion, seeing how short is the time since I spoke at considerable length on these points, that I should do well to confine myself to one or two subjects which are somewhat foreign in part to those I spoke of before, and then to proceed to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure as now laid on the table of this House. With regard to the progress of the colony, I may simply and briefly allude to the (and, if hon. members will refer to the papers laid before them, and especially the Blue Book for the past year, they will see it) satisfactory increase in the area of cultivated agricultural land within the colony. The increase last year was certainly one that was gratifying; for we find that, whereas the area of cultivated land, previous to last year, amounted to not much over 80,000 acres of land, during the past year we find it was over 100,000 acres, or an increase of nearly 25 per cent. Again, we find an increase in pastoral properties—a very large and material increase. Hon. members must be aware, Sir Thomas Campbell, of the correspondence that has been laid on the table of the House, during the current session, on the subject of a scheme for State colonisation. There are two things, above all others, that this colony stands greatly in need of—increased population and increased capital; but increased capital, without increased population, will not result in the future good. Let us trust that the expenditure and indebtedness we have incurred will prove remunerative when we obtain that increase of population which is so neces-

sary to us. The correspondence I was alluding to, Sir Thomas Campbell, is, as I have said, that respecting a State colonisation scheme, as proposed by the Imperial Colonisation Committee. If hon. members will refer to these papers, they will find that the Committee is a very important one, and consists of no less than 32 members of the House of Lords, and 135 members of the House of Commons, of all shades of political opinion. They have carefully considered the question, and have collected a large amount of information, on which they have arrived at a scheme which is shortly comprised in these words: "That there should be a colonisation board with Imperial and Colonial representation; that the capital be raised by public subscription to a 'colonisation land rent charge stock,' bearing interest at 3 per cent. per annum, to be guaranteed by the Imperial Government for a term of 30 years (and that was an important point); that preference be given to colonists who contribute towards outlay; that the rent charge be redeemed by the colonists within 30 years." It will be thus seen from the words of this memorandum, that colonisation and not emigration is the active principle in this scheme. "Emigration," as the memorandum states, "is merely the transfer of surplus labor from the mother country to the colonies, and, by itself, cannot be recommended as the foundation for any national action, involving, as it does, increased competition in the colonial labor markets, without necessarily developing colonial resources or improving the condition of the emigrant.

Colonisation on the other hand is the settlement of unoccupied colonial lands"; and that is what is so necessary in this colony. The same committee say: "Nothing is proposed to be done without the assent and co-operation of the Colonial Governments who are to be represented on the Colonisation Board." As I have said, the interest is to be guaranteed by the Imperial Government and the capital is to be subscribed by the public, and is to be a first charge on the holdings. These are, briefly and shortly, the main points which I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to, in regard to the colonisation scheme. I refer to the matter now as I shall not probably have another opportunity of again speak-

ing on the papers, which have been laid on the table of this House. His Excellency the Governor, it will be observed, in his despatch to Lord Knutsford of 13th August, last, on this subject, says:—"I concur with the Executive Council, whom I have consulted in the matter, in thinking that some such project as has been sketched out by the Parliamentary Committee might very well be put in operation in the South-West district of this colony." Further, His Excellency states: "The South-West corner of this continent offers, I think, a great field for a really national scheme of colonisation. I do not know, taking all this into consideration, whether any such field can be found elsewhere in Her Majesty's dominions." Now, sir, it appears to me that this is a matter from which we may hope for great results; for hon. members will allow that in the South-West division of this colony we are possessed of large amounts of valuable agricultural land which need capital and labor to be of public benefit to the colony; and, therefore, we trust that this scheme may be further developed and matured, and be in working form ere long. Before I conclude my remarks on this point, I may be permitted to read a few lines from an article in a leading English newspaper, which I think is particularly applicable here. It says:—"For such unemployed, and in the interest of a whole nation, a system of State-aided emigration must be inaugurated. Than this, no more beneficent legislation could occupy the attention of an Imperial Senate, and no better field could be found for the exercise of the administrative abilities of a Federal Secretary of State for the Colonies." Now a few words, sir, with regard to our loans. I will draw attention to the fact that great attention has been paid of late years by all the colonies—especially the Australian colonies—to the desirability of getting money at a lower rate of interest than in the past; and this matter has commanded great attention, and I have some observations here which emanated from an old and very experienced financier and a former settler of Australia—Mr. Westgarth—in which he urges that the whole of the stocks of each colony should be consolidated and that they should be inscribed. Hon. members are aware that we have taken steps during

the last few years to have this suggestion acted upon. Mr. Westgarth says:—"Stocks should be inscribed; that is to say investors, trustees, &c., do not like the risk of open or 'bearer' stock, or indeed the dangers of holding any form of stock at all, even the registered." He further goes on to say that he sees no reason why future loans should not be obtained at 3 per cent. This is a matter of great importance, because if (as we believe we shall have to) we can go largely into the money market by consolidating the loans and reducing the interest, we shall get money on much lower terms, and hence it will be much easier to carry out the necessary public works we in time must have. Mr. Westgarth concludes this letter by stating his strong advice that in the future the colonies should go in for 3 per cent. loans, and all hon. members must be aware of the immense advantage it will be to this colony to obtain money at a lower rate than 4 per cent. And again, we should inscribe our stock and make it unlimited, so that we may encourage investors to take up our loans and be otherwise advantageous to the colony. Passing, Sir Thomas Campbell, to the question before us--the ways and means and the proposed expenditure—I would point out to hon. members that with regard to the revenue, it will be seen that the Government proposes to repay to revenue the cost of a considerable number of works, that have been paid for, from revenue, and it is proposed to do this in a sum not exceeding £60,512. This enables the Government to place the Colonial revenue in a satisfactory position, and simply to do justice by returning to it the cost of all those works which, had the money been available, would have been incurred from the loan. I regret to say (and it becomes evident from the balance-sheet attached to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure) that it has been necessary to debit the expenditure side by no less a sum than £40,500. As hon. members are aware, at the beginning of the session His Excellency the Governor drew attention to the fact that it was feared that at the end of the year the revenue would be deficient to the extent of £30,000. In addition to this estimated deficiency hon. members are aware that no less than £10,500 had to be provided for the

damages in the case of "McDonald and Mockford v. the Government," which, together with the £30,000 referred to, makes the sum £40,500. The depression in the revenue arises mainly from three sources, that is to say, land, customs, and railways. The deficit in the land for the year, which is entirely, as my hon. friend the Commissioner of Lands informs me, on account of the smallness of sales, is £4,000, on customs £15,000, and on railways £14,000. On the other hand the revenue from other sources shows an increase of about £3,000, reducing the estimated deficiency to about £30,000. It may be satisfactory to hon. members to know that the falling off in the revenue is not attributable to the altered tariff. I have had an elaborate and detailed return prepared by the Collector of Customs, showing the difference between the Customs duties received from 7th January to the 26th July, 1888, under the new tariff, and what would have been received under the late tariff for the same period had it been in force. I was anxious to ascertain this, because I was not satisfied within myself as to how the present tariff, which to a certain extent is a protective one, operated. The result, I am glad to say, has been that, although there has been a falling off in trade, the revenue has improved, or, in the words of the Collector himself,—"to explain the anticipated falling off of Customs revenue for the current year, it is necessary to supplement the figures already given by a statement showing the total value of the import trade for the period on which these duties are based, as compared with the import trade for the same period of last year, by which it will be seen that the trade has fallen off (for this period) to the extent of £40,455 4s. 3d., while the revenue, although below what it was last year, is actually £1,710 15s. 6½d. more than it would have been had the duties been collected under the tariff in force last year." This, I think, is an interesting fact, which hon. members should know. I am not aware, Sir Thomas Campbell, that I need dwell on the question of expenditure, for we shall go through all the items which are here set forth and provided for. I will, therefore, now simply draw attention to the fact that more liberal provision has been made this year for surveys, and also

a more liberal amount has been put down for roads and bridges. The amount for contract surveys is increased to £10,000, in order to afford fuller scope for the working of the present land regulations, and the grant to the Road Boards has been increased to a like amount of £10,000. There are many other matters I might dwell on, but, as I have said, when we come to consider the Estimates in detail I shall have an opportunity for referring to them. I will, therefore, not keep the committee longer on the present occasion, and will now move the first item,—“Governor’s Establishment, £743 16s. 8d.”

MR. PARKER moved that progress be reported, and leave given to sit again on Wednesday, 21st November.

PROTECTION OF KIMBERLEY SETTLERS AGAINST THE NATIVES.

MR. A. FORREST, in accordance with notice, moved the following resolution: “That, in the opinion of this House, it is most urgently desirable that strong and prompt measures should be taken to protect the settlers in Kimberley and their property from the treacherous hostility of the aborigines. That this House is of opinion that the best method of securing this result, and at the same time the most humane in respect to the aborigines, would be to add a sufficient number of special constables, selected in the locality, to whatever police force may be available to form an expedition strong enough to resist, subdue, and leave a lasting impression upon the minds of these aborigines, such an impression that will make it plain to them that an attitude of hostility to the settlers will not be permitted; and that an humble address be presented to His Excellency, praying that the wishes of this House be carried out.” In rising to move this motion (the hon. member said), I do so not with any degree of pleasure certainly,—far from it. I have brought it forward entirely in the interests of the district I have the honor to represent, and, before I conclude, I think I shall be able to show members that it is necessary in the interests of the white population of the district that something should be done that will give these natives a lesson, from which they will learn to stop what they

are now doing—eating the stock of the settlers faster than they can produce it. I have worded this motion in rather strong language, but it must be clearly understood that in advocating this step to be taken I am not advocating that a party of police, with a number of settlers attached to it as special constables, should go out to the bush and shoot down these natives. That is not the intention of the resolution at all. My intention is that a large *posse* of police, assisted by a number of settlers, who should be sworn in, should go into the worst part of the district where these natives commit their thefts, the Lennard river, and arrest a number of the ring-leaders of these men, and bring them to Derby for trial, and, if found guilty, have them sentenced to a term of years at Rottneest. That is the punishment I mean. The settlers of the district have gone to enormous expense in fencing their runs, and nearly all of them have their paddocks enclosed, but these fences are utterly useless, because the natives come down from the hills in broad daylight, and carry away as many sheep as they require, from time to time. The police are unable to do anything to help the settlers, because they are only small in number, and it would be hardly safe for a few constables to go out into this hill country, and try to arrest these natives. The settlers are quite willing to help them, so as to stop themselves from being ruined, and the district being abandoned so far as sheep-breeding goes; and, in order to show the present state of things, with the permission of the House, I will read a letter from a settler living in the Lennard river district, Mr. Lukin, a worthy respectable settler, who has been there for some years, and who has done everything in his power to increase his stock and develop the country. (Letter read.) This gentleman had 12,000 or 13,000 sheep some time ago, but now he has not got nearly as many, in consequence of the natives’ depredations, and setting fire to his paddocks. He seems thoroughly disgusted with the way the Government treat them, and says it is useless for the settlers to spend their money in improving their runs and increasing their stock, that these natives steal the sheep faster than they can breed them; and,

unless something is done very shortly the district will have to be abandoned, and the natives left masters of the situation. I would also draw the attention of members to certain letters that have appeared on the subject, from other settlers, in the *Western Mail* and the *Morning Herald*, and especially a letter written by Mr. G. J. Poulton, a very old settler, who describes the present position of affairs very clearly. What I would ask this House is to call upon the Government to protect the settlers from these depredations, and to teach these natives on the Ashburton, the Gascoyne, the Lennard, and all these districts of the North a lesson which they will not forget in a hurry, and which will teach them to fear and respect the white man. Unless we do something to protect our settlers I should like to know in what position they are likely to find themselves, if this state of things is allowed to go on, and the Government do nothing in the matter. I should like my hon. friend the Attorney General to have a sheep station in this Kimberley district, and all the property he has in the world invested there, and to know how he would like to find his sheep diminishing faster than he could rear them. I would like to ask my learned friend, who has a knowledge of the law, what he would do in such a position, knowing that if he protects himself and takes the law into his own hands he will be punished, and that if he succeeds in arresting any of these natives he does so at the risk of his life, and if he brings them all the way to Derby they will, at the utmost, get twelve months imprisonment, and probably escape, and go back again ten times worse than they were before. These natives simply get more knowing when they are treated in this way, and more bold. In fact they are so bold now that they come down from the hills, in broad daylight, to steal the sheep of the settlers, and the settlers daren't follow them, nor can the police catch them. Kimberley is not like other districts, a waterless country; it is well watered, and these natives can keep out of the reach of the police, something like the "Kelly gang" used to do in Victoria. All I ask is that the Government will at once take steps to increase the police force for the time being in the Kimberley district, and

let some of the settlers be sworn in to assist them. I believe any number of settlers would be willing to be sworn in as special constables; and when there is a strong party organised they could go out and arrest the ringleaders, and have them tried and let them be sent down here for a term of three or five years, instead of playing with them by giving them a few months at Derby, and letting them escape before they have half finished it. The language of the resolution is very strong, I know, but I think not a bit stronger than the circumstances warrant; I have been asked by some hon. members to withdraw it, but I cannot consent to that, and, if I stand alone, I intend to move it. I think it is only common justice to these settlers that they should have some protection. If the Government let land to these people and receive their rents, and the settlers do all they can to improve the country, they have a right to be protected. I have had a large experience with the natives of this colony, and know them well; I do not believe at all in shooting them, but I certainly think some steps should be taken to put an end to the present state of things, which is simply intolerable. It's a wonder to me the settlers stand it. No one who knows what they have to put up with would blame them if they took the law into their own hands. It is not very pleasant to see your property dwindling away day by day under your very eyes, and yourself set at defiance by hordes of natives, while the Government stand by and give you no assistance. I think if a burglar came into our houses in Perth we should be very much inclined to take the law into our own hands, and go for that burglar; and I don't see why these unprotected settlers at the far North, who have their lives and property at the mercy of these natives, should not be allowed to teach them a lesson, in the way I have said. I hope the Colonial Secretary, on behalf of the Government, will give me such an assurance to-night that I shall be able to send word to my constituents that the Government, seeing the justice of this resolution, will immediately take strong measures to put down this wholesale stealing of sheep in this district.

MR. SHOLL: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion, though with other members I do not agree altogether with

the wording of the resolution, because I think it would lead the House, or, at any rate, people outside, to believe that the intention was to send an armed force out to decimate these natives, and, if necessary, that the settlers should have resort to firearms. But the hon. member has told us that is not his intention; nor is it my intention, in seconding the motion, that anything of the sort should be done. It is a well-known fact that the state of things now existing in the Kimberley district cannot be tolerated much longer by the long-suffering settlers. Goodness knows it is bad enough to endure the hardships of a pioneering life in a tropical climate, far away from every comfort of civilisation, without seeing their property stolen under their very eyes, and they powerless to prevent it. I understand that an amendment in the wording of the resolution is going to be moved, which will meet with general support, and at the same time have the same effect as the hon. member desires; and it is to be hoped the Government will accept it, and act upon it. If they intend these Northern parts of the colony to be settled it is their duty to protect the settlers. It is nonsense for the Government to say they have no funds at their disposal. If they cannot find the funds to protect their own settlers the best thing they can do is to hand over the Kimberley district to South Australia, or some other colony that will find the funds. It is nonsense for the Government to come here and say we have no money, and we cannot protect these distant settlers, as they desire us to do. Sir, if they consider the district is worth settling, and they consider they are justified in receiving rents from the settlers, it is their bounden duty, I say, to protect these settlers, no matter what it costs. There is nothing else for it. They must either abandon the district, or protect those who are seeking to develop it. There is only a very small police force up there at present, nothing like sufficient to look after such a large area of country as this Kimberley district. Some of these constables have lately been invalided with fever, and had to come away; and, unfortunately, the Resident Magistrate is often away, and I understand the Inspector of Police is told off to do his duty, and I believe one of the

members of the force is acting as his clerk, thus further weakening the strength of the police up there. I think this ought not to be allowed. I think the Resident Magistrate ought to be compelled to stick to his post, and let the Inspector and his men stick to their own duties; and, if the Resident Magistrate has to go away, somebody else ought to take his place, and not the Inspector. It is nonsense to expect a lot of settlers situated as these settlers are—let them be as forbearing as they like—to see their property taken away in broad daylight, under their very eyes, and, sooner or later, do nothing to protect themselves. For my part, I think my patience would have been worn out before this, if I saw my sheep stolen in this way, and the Government doing nothing to stop it. I think I should be inclined to try and stop it myself, and take the chance of the consequence before a jury of my fellow-countrymen. It is a nonsensical idea that the Government have got into their head, emanating no doubt from the Home Government, that the natives are to be allowed to do what they like to ruin the poor unfortunate white settler in those far outlying districts. It's a crying shame that such an idea should be entertained. I speak warmly on the subject because I feel warmly. I know it must be very galling to these settlers, and the wonder to me is how their stock of patience is not exhausted. We in this part of the colony, surrounded with the conveniences of civilisation, have our lives and property protected, and if a thief or a burglar commits any depredation he is soon arrested and brought to justice. But these outlying settlers are left to their own resources—in fact they are not allowed to do that, for they are told they must not protect themselves. I am told that they have been instructed by the magistrate up there that if the natives assault them they must retire into their houses, and must not attempt to protect themselves until a native actually throws his spear at them. [The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, no.] Of course we know that is not the law; but that is what they are told, and the settlers feel themselves in this position: if they take the law into their own hands—I do not mean by shooting down the natives, but simply arrest them, on their own responsibility,

when they catch them stealing their sheep, and chastise them, they know they will probably be brought down a long distance to Derby to answer the charge. On the other hand, it is not very convenient for these settlers to have to prosecute these natives, even if they do catch them. The consequence is the native is complete master of the situation. I have no wish at all that power should be given these settlers to shoot down the natives who commit these offences—far from it. All we ask is that a sufficient police force be provided to patrol the district, so as to give the settlers and their property some protection. I think it is the duty of the Government to do this much at any cost; and, if the excuse is, they cannot find the necessary funds, for goodness' sake let us hand over the district to some colony that can do so.

MR. RICHARDSON: I propose, sir, to move an amendment upon the resolution, which I hope will meet with the approval of the majority of members, and I think it will have very much the same effect. There are certain words in the resolution which appear to me objectionable, to some extent, or, at any rate, are calculated to create a false impression. To those who really understand this native question, and who are able to realise the position of affairs, there is not much harm in the resolution; but, outside this House, and especially in certain circles (which I need not further allude to) where there are those who are always on the watch for any pretext to attach a significance to words and to attribute motives to actions, that are unworthy and unjustifiable,—to people like these there are words in the resolution which probably would afford a convenient peg; and I think we ought to be very careful to guard ourselves against providing these people—either here, or in Exeter Hall circles at home—with pegs upon which to hang any cloak for attacks that are really groundless upon the characters of Western Australians in their treatment of the native population. We have had rather too much of this sort of thing already, and I think it is our duty to avoid giving any pretext for these unworthy tactics, which we know a certain class are only too ready to adopt. The amendment I have to propose is in the

following words: "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, informing His Excellency that in the opinion of this House it is urgently desirable that strong and prompt measures should be taken for the protection of the lives and property of the settlers in Kimberley, against the depredations of the natives, now becoming alarmingly frequent; and that—as much in the interests of the whites as of the blacks—a state of things should be prevented, which, if unchecked, must eventually lead to guerrilla warfare and regrettable reprisals." Having said this, I must say I fully sympathise with the object of the original resolution. I believe such a resolution was urgently required. I think we cannot too strongly impress upon the Government that the time has arrived when something must be done to provide greater protection for the settlers of this part of the colony. If they are not assured that some prompt action will be taken by the Government, I believe their patience *will* become exhausted, and the consequences may be very serious, and very much regretted by all of us. Human nature may stand a good deal, but we all know it has its limits of endurance; and when settlers situated in these far-off and isolated portions of the colony find that their lives and property are in constant danger, and that they can expect no adequate protection from the constituted authorities, it is difficult to resist the temptation of taking the law into your own hands, however repugnant it may be to your sense of morality. Unfortunately the law as interpreted and as administered here, and as certain sections of humanity perhaps like to see it administered, is certainly not calculated to harmonise with one's sense of morality, or even common justice. We hear a great deal about one law for the rich and another for the poor, and one law for the white and another for the black; but, so far as the tendency of legislation in this colony of late years has gone, I think the law is altogether in favor of the black. No matter how the settler is imposed upon and insulted, the native race must be protected. Let the black man receive every protection in our power, but let the white man look after himself. I do not think any person is really capable of forming a just con-

ception of this native question unless he has had some practical experience to guide him. He cannot realise the situation—I defy him. He cannot possibly sympathise with these settlers in the position they are placed in, unless he has himself had some experience of it, and also of the habits and the unwritten laws of the natives. No one—I care not who he may be, or how estimable he may be—no one can enter into the feelings of desperation which these settlers are driven to, unless they have some practical knowledge of the position in which they are placed, at the mercy of these untutored savages. We who are acquainted with their nature and their customs know, once their blood is up, and they are obeying the savage impulse of some tribal custom, they will take human life without the slightest compunction. They have none of the restraining influences which control more civilised people; and, once they get into that frame of mind, I believe a species of madness comes over them, and that they neither know nor care what they do. They positively gloat in the blood of their victim. Although a very valuable servant when trained, and properly cared for—as I believe the natives in the service of our settlers are, as a rule—we know very well that no good can be got out of these savage races until they are taught to recognise the fact that their employers are really their masters, and that their duty is to obey their masters. Once they get the idea that they are at liberty either to obey or leave it alone, or to defy those who are willing to employ them, then all hope of discipline or good management is out of the question. And nobody can learn these things except from experience, and personal contact with these natives. Nobody can realise the gravity of the situation so far as these isolated settlers are concerned, unless they have been through it themselves. Therefore it is that I think the Government in dealing with this question should pay a little more heed to what is told them by men who really understand the position—provided they know that these men are also reasonable and humane persons, and not likely to be influenced by any unworthy motives. If the Government took such men as these into their counsel—men who have had practical experience of a settler's life

amidst such surroundings as these—I am very certain of this: it would be a good thing for the natives themselves as well as the settlers.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser): I feel sure, sir, that the feeling of the Government in this matter is at one with that of the mover of the amendment, and I may say with the mover of the original resolution, although I must say that the resolution, in its wording, is one which I regret went into print, for it really seems to advocate an internecine war between the two races, white and black, both Her Majesty's subjects, which would lead to the destruction of the inferior by the superior race; and I am quite sure neither the hon. member himself, nor anyone else, wishes that. Both the resolution and the amendment allude to the necessity of the Government doing this and doing that; but hon. members must be perfectly aware that it is this Council that provides the sinews of war; it is this Council that must provide the money to enable the Government to augment its police force, not only in this particular district, but in other parts of the colony. Hon. members are also aware that, at their own request, the police force of the colony was very considerably reduced, or the vote was—something between 15 and 20 per cent. Yet hon. members ask the Government to increase the police protection for these outlying settlers. There was an admirable provision in the old Land Regulations—it has disappeared now—which set forth that, as regards the settlement of our Northern lands, the pioneer settlers must, in a great measure, be their own protectors, that it was not within the power of the Government to extend the protecting arm of the law into every corner of this vast territory of ours. Those Northern settlers, I believe, had the same difficulties to contend with as the Kimberley settlers. But the Kimberley settlers have scattered themselves over an immense tract of country, and it would absorb the whole of our limited police force if we were to give them that protection which they wish. Hon. members may rest assured that the Government has never lost sight of the position of affairs up there. I was sorry to hear one hon. member suggesting that we should hand over this district to some

other colony. [Mr. SHOLL: Quite right; I do think so, if we cannot protect our settlers.] I am sure the Government is as anxious as any member of this House to make all the provision we can, so far as our funds will enable us, for the protection of the Kimberley settlers, as well as other settlers. There have been mistaken ideas current no doubt as to what the law is on the subject of settlers defending themselves and their property from native attacks. The hon. member for Gascoyne made some allusion to a belief which he says prevails in the minds of the settlers that, if they are attacked, their duty is to retreat into their houses. [Mr. SHOLL: That's the law as laid down by the competent men the Government send up there as magistrates.] I hope it is unnecessary that I should say such is not the law. Every settler must surely know that when he is attacked he can defend himself. But the settlers must not become the aggressors; they must not go out and hunt up the natives like they would kangaroos; they must not adopt the system known in the early days of Queensland as that of "dispersion," which meant that parties were organised to go out not only to disperse the natives, but were not expected to return until they had annihilated them. Of course that sort of thing cannot be tolerated; nor do I insinuate for one moment that it exists. These natives must be treated, as far as practicable, with consideration; at the same time, hon. members may rest assured that the position of the settlers has been a matter of great concern to the Government: and the Government will only be too glad to co-operate with the Legislature in considering what steps should be taken, so far as our means go, to deal with this matter of police protection. Members now have the Estimates before them, and they will see how the Government are situated in the matter of funds. Increased police protection means increased expenditure, and I must again remind the House that only last session it cut down the police vote very considerably.

Mr. HARPER: The Colonial Secretary has asked why the settlers in the Kimberley district do not find themselves in a position to deal with the natives in the same way as the settlers in the early days of the North district did. If I may

be allowed to answer him, I say the conditions are very much altered. Year after year, for years past, the Government have urged measures upon this House, and this House has agreed to them, which virtually amount to an extenuation of native depredations, by preventing magistrates from dealing with these cases except at great inconvenience to the settlers, and by debarring them, when a conviction is obtained, from passing upon the offending natives a sentence which can in any way act as a deterrent. These measures were not the law in the early days of the North district. If the hon. gentleman were to refer to the records of his office he would find there the draft of a letter which was sent from that office some years ago to the settlers of the Northern district, in reply to a communication from the settlers of the district pointing out the difficulties under which settlement at that time was being carried out, in consequence of active depredations. The answer of the Government in those days to that communication was to this effect: the settlers were advised to band themselves together to resist the attacks of native depredators on their property. I feel quite certain there has been nothing in the action of the Government of late years which would lead the settlers now to suppose that the Government would support them in such a line of action in defence of their property. The hon. gentleman says the Government are quite alive to the position of affairs in the Kimberley district. They may be alive to it, but their policy is one of "masterly inactivity." All experience of savage races has gone to prove beyond doubt that until the savage is made to realise the power of the civilised white all attempts to treat with them are perfectly useless. One of the greatest and most distinguished military generals of India has put it on record, after a long experience of rebel tribes in that country, that if you have a rebel's life at heart you must threaten to take it. After some years spent amongst these native rebels, this same eminent commander, by his knowledge of the native character, and treating them upon that principle, was able at the time of the Mutiny to levy some of the most valuable and trustworthy Sepoy regiments to assist the British army in putting down the

rebellion. This brings to my mind a remark I once heard a native in the North-West of this colony make. A report had reached us of the murder of a white man, and this native said: "What fools blackfellows are to take lives of white men; if they would only look they would see that the points of our spears are made of wood, and the points of the white man's weapons are made of iron." The sooner the better these savage races are brought to understand that there can be no peace nor security for the life of white nor black, that property is of very little value, unless there exists a feeling of united trust and dependency, and that it is in the interest of the natives themselves as well as of the whites that prompt measures should be taken to punish crime, and to teach them the power of our law. There has been of late years, no doubt, a very strong attempt made to weaken rather than to strengthen the authority of the white over the black in this colony, and no one practically acquainted with the subject would deny that the result has been to embolden the natives, and to encourage them to encroach upon the rights and property of the settlers. I am speaking strongly in the interests of the natives themselves when I say that the sooner they are taught to respect our laws and to appreciate the penalties attached to the breaking of those laws, either as affecting life or property, the better it will be for all parties, and the less bloodshed will result. It is infinitely better that a few sharp lessons should be taught any natives caught in the act of stealing the property of the settlers— which, I may tell hon. members who are not acquainted with these natives, is only a short step from taking the life of the settler, for a native who has learnt to spear sheep is on the high road to spear the owner of them. Murder, in fact, is looked on as a matter of honor among them. A native who can spear a white man is regarded as a hero among his tribe; and the sooner these people are taught to respect our laws the better it will be for themselves and for us. As to the question of expense, the Colonial Secretary says the Government have not the funds to provide better police protection to prevent these natives committing depredations. I should

like to ask the Government whether they do not consider that in these cases prevention is not only better than cure, but also cheaper. If murders are committed, money must be found sooner or later to bring the murderers to justice, and I need not remind this House of the enormous sums which it has cost this colony in the past to bring these offenders to justice. I do not wish it to be understood that I would urge that a policy should be adopted which would bring us into conflict with the black, but the readiest and promptest measures should be taken to teach him what the law of the white man is, and that he must obey it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest): Sir,—I had not intended speaking on this motion, but, after what has fallen from hon. members, I feel, sitting here on this bench, that I owe a duty not only to the white but also a duty to the native population, and I am sorry to find that all the speakers on the other side of the House, in this debate, have only looked at this question from one point of view, and not one word of sympathy has fallen from them for the aboriginal inhabitants of the colony. I do not think that is exactly the right way to look at this matter. We are here sitting as it were in judgment between the black race and the white, and we must try and regard the question from a fair and reasonable point of view. That is the way I want to look at it now, and without any wish on my part to import any feeling into the matter or to say anything against the white settler, whom I respect, and whose interests, so far as in my power lies I am willing and anxious to protect, not only as regards his life but also as regards his property. The hon. member for the Gascoyne, in speaking of this matter, would lead members to suppose that the Government were not taking any steps whatever for the protection of the settlers, that they have some nonsensical ideas in their head that their whole duty is to protect the natives, and that they altogether leave out of account their duty to the white population. [Mr. SKOLL: Hear, hear.] I am sorry to hear the hon. member say so. So far as my knowledge goes that is in no way a correct statement of the facts. I would ask hon. members

how many instances—if they can point to one instance I will be satisfied—in which the Government have attempted to prosecute a white settler in this Kimberley district for any ill-treatment of an aboriginal native? Anyone would be led to believe from the hon. member for Gascoyne's speech that these settlers lived in fear and trembling, lest for any paltry castigation they inflicted upon a native they might be summoned and brought to trial, and punished with the utmost severity of the law. I should like him to point out to one solitary instance where the law has been set in motion in this Kimberley district against a white for castigating a native offender. There is no instance on record. I have asked both my hon. colleagues who are on the Aborigines Protection Board if there has to their knowledge been one instance of a Kimberley settler having been summoned before a magistrate for castigating or chastising a native, and they tell me they are not aware of such a case. Therefore, to charge the Government with having any nonsensical notions about protecting the rights of the natives as against the rights of the whites is simply absurd. The hon. member says that when these settlers see a native approaching they are in such dread of the law that they retire into their houses. [Mr. SHOLL: I said nothing of the kind.] I have got a note of the hon. member's words. [Mr. SHOLL: I said they were instructed by the magistrate that if they were attacked they should retire. That was told me by a settler.] I should think the settlers would not take much notice of that magistrate. Every man is justified in protecting his own life, and his property, so long as he does so without resorting to undue violence. But I think it is only reasonable that settlers going into these remote districts, and among these savage tribes, should take ordinary care and precaution against their property being stolen, or their persons being attacked. I have heard it said, on the authority of persons whose testimony could be produced if necessary, that there are instances in the Kimberley district in which the stations of settlers are left entirely unprotected. The police have visited these stations, and found no one in charge of them, and everything left to the mercy of any native who

might choose to visit it. It was only a few days ago I saw an official document setting forth how a police party that was engaged in hunting up some native offenders came to a station belonging to Mr. Poulton, situated in the very stronghold of these natives, and there was not a soul in charge. The party then went on and came to the Meda River company's station, and found that again with no one in charge. This is simply tempting these untutored savages, it seems to me. If settlers—I do not care for what reason, whether poverty or what—if settlers cannot go to the trouble of exercising the most ordinary precaution for the protection of their property, they have no right to come to this House and ask it to protect it for them. Anyone who has had any experience of bush life and the natives knows very well that if he leaves his camp unprotected the chances are his rations will be stolen. I never heard of such a thing, that in a far-off, isolated district like this, in the very heart of a native tribe that have become notorious for stealing, the settlers should leave their stations and their homesteads unprotected, and then expect their property to be secure. With regard to the question now before the House, I think from my experience of the country, I can suggest a practical way of dealing with this matter, and a way of dealing with it that will not necessitate the arming of the police or the swearing in of special constables. I know the district pretty well, especially that portion of it now referred to, the valley of the Fitzroy and the Lennard, and the head waters of the Robinson: and the only portion of this country where I think there is any difficulty in capturing these natives is in the hilly or mountainous country. On the flat lands you can trace them, and you can apprehend them without much difficulty; but in the hilly country it is impossible for anyone to follow these natives to arrest them. They know that. My plan would be this: instead of having the police, as at present, stationed at Derby, I would have them camped out at the spots where the natives are most troublesome. I would have two constables, with native assistants, stationed under canvas, at these places; and, I believe, if this plan were adopted, in a very short time these troubles with the

natives would cease. The natives, if they committed depredations, would be easily secured, before they retreated to the mountainous country, and I believe these depredations would soon come to an end. There is another point I should like to know with regard to these natives, and that is how far any attempt is made by the settlers to give them employment on their stations, as in other parts of the North. I should like to know whether these natives are altogether bad and incorrigible, or whether it is only a limited portion of the district that has become so demoralised; and whether their services are in any way availed of by the settlers as shepherds, stockriders, and such occupations. Other portions of our Northern territory have been settled and developed largely through the instrumentality of the native population; and many of us (including myself) would not be in the position we are in to-day, if we had not been able to avail ourselves of native labor on our stations. Therefore, while dealing with this question of the settlers and the natives, let us be fair and reasonable, and do justice to these natives. [Mr. RICHARDSON: We desire to do so.] Let us do what we can for them. [Mr. HARPER: Teach them to obey our laws.] We know that can be done. It has been done in other parts of the colony, and these natives have become most useful and most valuable to the whites. I hope that nothing I have said will tend to injure the feelings of any member of this House, or of anyone out of it. I think hon. members who have spoken upon this subject—and no doubt they have spoken under some excitement, thinking of the losses which some of their constituents have sustained from native depredations—but I think hon. members have spoken altogether from a one-sided point of view. Not one word of sympathy towards the native population have I heard from them; and, I think, in dealing with a question of this kind, we should look at it from both sides, which is the way the Government try to look at it. While on the one hand we will not allow the natives, if we can help it, to steal the sheep of the settlers, or imperil their lives, we expect, on the other hand, that the settlers will take reasonable precautions against being robbed. If they do that, I see no reason whatever why

some means could not be devised for the better security of their property. I believe, myself, that the practical plan I have mentioned—it was only yesterday I had an opportunity of seeing an official report on this very subject—would, in a few months, have a practical and satisfactory result.

MR. E. R. BROCKMAN said he rose to point out a mistake which the Commissioner of Crown Lands was making, when he said he did not think the Kimberley settlers were at all afraid to protect themselves from the natives. The hon. gentleman ridiculed what was said by the hon. member for the Gascoyne about the settlers retiring into their houses when the natives appeared. He might inform the hon. gentleman that not only were the settlers afraid to defend themselves, but Government employes even were afraid of these natives; and he could give a case in point. His (Mr. Brockman's) son, who was with a Government survey party up there, was one day away, and Mr. Monaghan, another member of the party, who was well accustomed to the bush and to natives, and a man not at all likely to be easily scared, came across some natives, who pulled up the survey pegs, and ordered him to clear off, and he had to go to his camp, leaving the natives masters of the situation. That was a wrong state of things altogether, but it showed the state of feeling in the district. He did not blame Monaghan at all; probably, if he had done anything to these natives he would have been brought down here to answer for it. It did seem ridiculous that the Government should take this country, and expect the settlers to pay them rent, and yet be unable to protect them from these natives, or even to protect their own servants. It might be a question whether we had a moral right to take these black people's land away from them, but if the question was decided in the affirmative he thought we had a right to subjugate these natives, and to bring them under the law. It was mere foolishness to go on leaving things in their present state. The Government pleaded that they had no means; if that was the case, and they were too poor to protect the country, they ought to leave it alone, abandon it to the natives, who at present seemed to be masters of the situation, or give it up to

Queensland or some other colony who had the means to look after it. If we retained possession of the place, we were bound to protect the employes of the Government and the settlers of the district.

Mr. MARMION moved the adjournment of the debate.

Agreed to.

Debate adjourned.

SCAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time.

CLOSURE OF STREETS FOR RAILWAY PURPOSES.

On the order of the day for the resumption of the debate upon Sir T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL's motion,

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said he had an amendment to propose, which, he believed, would meet the views of the hon. baronet, and also the views of the Commissioner of Railways. It was as follows: "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Government should in all cases retain power to re-open streets closed under the provisions of the 12th section of the 42nd Vict., No. 31 (Railways Act, 1878)." Hon. members, after the debate that had already taken place, would be aware of the object of the motion: it was in order that the Government might be placed in a position—if, in the interests of the public, it should be deemed desirable hereafter to re-open any streets which may have been closed for railway purposes—to do so, notwithstanding the right vested in the Commissioner of Railways, or in any railway company, to close such streets.

Mr. KEANE asked how this amendment would affect the rights of the railway syndicates now carrying out a contract with the Government. These contracts had been entered into under certain powers and privileges, and care must be taken that they were not nullified.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) did not see how the amendment could annul or abrogate any rights established under a contract at present in force. It was simply intended to make provision that in the event of its being found hereafter expedient, in the

interests of the public, to re-open any public road or street, already recognised as such, the Government should have the power to do so.

Mr. PARKER said it appeared to him that neither the amendment nor the original motion meant anything by itself. If the Government desired to obtain this power to re-open streets which had been closed under a Railways Act it would be necessary for the Government to have statutory power to do so. A mere resolution would not over-ride the provisions of an Act of Council. He could not help thinking that a great deal of the present irritation and ill-feeling at Albany, and in some cases at Perth, and possibly other towns intersected by a railway, would have been avoided if the practice had obtained of having detailed plans of the proposed route of any line about to be constructed, with the roads and streets it would cross, placed on the table of the House, so that the public might be heard, before the streets were closed. In England, he believed, a select committee was usually formed to inquire into such questions, whenever a railway bill was introduced, and he hoped that in future the same course would be adopted here. It appeared to him that the new Standing Order, of which the Commissioner of Railways had given notice, would better effect the object in view than either the amendment or the original motion, which without a legislative enactment, could confer no power at all upon the Government contrary to the statutory power exercisable by the Commissioner under the Railways Act. He thought it would be their duty in future to see that every necessary provision, in the way of level crossings and other conveniences for public traffic, was inserted in any special Railway Act introduced.

Sir T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said he accepted the amendment very heartily, if it would enable his hon. friend the Commissioner of Railways to view the action he had taken in the matter in a different light from what he appeared to do the other evening—that it was intended in any way as a reflection upon anything which the hon. gentleman himself had done. He said, at the time, he was perfectly willing to believe that the hon. gentleman had acted (as he considered) in the best interests of the inhabitants of

Albany with regard to the streets in that town, so far as the present requirements of the town were concerned. What he (the hon. baronet) wanted was to provide for the future re-opening of streets; the present arrangement only referred to a comparatively small area, and a very much greater length of road would probably require to be dealt with hereafter. It was generally acknowledged that the town of Albany had an important future before it, and it would be regrettable—it would be simply a disgrace—if all these streets should remain closed, and there should be no power to re-open them. He was sorry that his hon. and learned friend the member for the North (Mr. Burt), upon whose advice he had been acting in this matter, was not in his place that evening to speak to the question, as he had intended doing. His hon. and learned friend had pointed out to him what had just been stated by the hon. and learned member for the Vasse, that in England an opportunity was given to the inhabitants to protest beforehand against the closure of any roads or streets which it was proposed to take for railway purposes; and it would be very desirable that in future this should be done here. But, in this particular instance, he doubted very much whether any hon. member, or whether the Commissioner himself, had any idea of the effect of that apparently innocent little Act passed last session. The hon. member for the Vasse said that the amendment would have no effect without a legislative enactment. Of course not. It was simply an expression of opinion, and he presumed the Government would bring in a bill to give them this statutory power; if they didn't, he would be prepared to do so himself. He wished to say, in reply to what fell from one or two hon. members the other evening, that he was not acting at all in the interests of the company in this matter, but in the interests of the inhabitants of Albany; and, as for his having been made a "tool" of by any agitators—he did not suppose the hon. member who said so meant it in an unparliamentary sense—he assured the hon. member he had nothing whatever to do with what the hon. member called "agitators." He was simply acting under the legal advice of his hon. and learned friend the mem-

ber for the North, and in the interests of the municipality.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. J. A. Wright) said he readily accepted the assurance of the hon. baronet that no censure upon his own action in this matter was intended by the resolution submitted by him the other evening; but, without the hon. member's disclaimer, it would undoubtedly have been open to that interpretation. As to the future, everyone knew that Albany was bound to increase in importance some day, and that the town would extend Northward, and probably the inhabitants would like to have a level crossing at every street in that direction. But, surely, neither the hon. member nor that House would wish or expect the railway company to go to the expense of providing all these crossings, which might be desired in time to come. That would be unreasonable. Nor would it be fair to the company, nor just. No such power existed in England, nor anywhere else. As the population and trade of the place increased, and the town extended, the town itself would have to provide such additional crossings as might be required and the object of the amendment was to enable the Government to empower them to do so, although the streets had been closed under a statutory power. But it would be absurd to expect the company to go to the expense of these additional crossings. As for some of the streets which certain people now talked about re-opening, the only practical way he could recommend for crossing them would be in a balloon.

MR. KEANE said it was a mere *lapsus lingue* on his part the other evening when he referred to the hon. member for Plantagenet as a tool for agitators, and he trusted the hon. baronet would allow him to withdraw the expression. He did not intend it in an offensive sense. With respect to the amendment of the Government, he failed to see the necessity of it at all. If the people of Albany or any other town wanted a street re-opened, or were not satisfied with what had been done, all they had to do was to get an Act introduced and passed for that purpose. At present, he thought the Albany people had got all they were entitled to.

MR. SHOLL thought it very desirable that the Government should have the

power to re-open streets closed for railway purposes, if they considered it necessary in the interests of the town; and, if that power did not vest in them at present, a bill ought to be introduced conferring such powers upon them so that the interests of the public might be protected.

Amendment put and passed.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL moved an humble address to the Governor, conveying the amendment.

Carried.

REDUCTION OF DUTY ON PEARL SHELLS.

On the order of the day for the resumption of the debate on the motion submitted by Mr. A. FORREST, in favor of reducing the export duty on pearl shells, no hon. member rising.

THE SPEAKER put the question—that the resolution be adopted—and it was negatived, on the voices.

PATENTS BILL.

This bill passed through committee, without discussion.

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

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Tuesday, 20th November, 1888.

Telephone wires between Perth and Fremantle—Non-Alienation by Trustees Bill: motion for second reading—Paris Exhibition, 1889: Representation of Western Australia—Patents Bill: third reading—Goldfields Licensing Bill: second reading—Civil Service Life Insurance Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at noon.

PRAYERS.

TELEPHONE WIRES BETWEEN PERTH AND FREMANTLE.

MR. SHENTON, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works whether, in view of the large

income received by the Telephone Department, arrangements could be made to remove the iron telephone wire between Perth and Fremantle, and replace the same with a copper wire; also to provide a separate wire for the use of the Government Department.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) said steps would be taken at once to have the work done.

NON-ALIENATION BY TRUSTEES BILL.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest): Sir,—I beg to move the second reading of “a bill to prevent the alienation, sale, or mortgage of land granted by the Crown for the promotion of religious, literary, educational, scientific, or other public purposes.” Hon. members will at once observe what the object of this small bill is. In all the deeds of grant made to these public bodies there are certain trusts inserted, specifying the object for which the land is granted, and it is granted to them for that use for ever. In grants made to religious bodies the usual form is that the land shall be held in trust for the purposes of that particular religious body, for ever; in other grants, such as the grants to literary institutes or educational bodies it is provided that the land shall for ever remain on trust as an endowment, and to be used only by the particular body to which it is granted. In some cases—the Church of England for one, I know; and I believe the Presbyterian Church, and probably others—these bodies have obtained a special Act of Council under which these trusts have been to some extent destroyed, inasmuch as power was given to the Governor or Governor in Council to permit them to alienate, or sell, or mortgage their lands; and the object of this bill is to provide that hereafter power shall not be given to the Governor or Governor in Council to sanction this being done; but that, if these trusts are to be interfered with or destroyed, it shall be done only by the special permission of the Legislative Council, by enactment, in each particular case. That is the whole scope and intention of the bill; and, for my own part, I think it is a very wise provision that lands once given by the Crown for a particular pur-