

**HANSARD 1886, Dec 15, Victorian Parliament***Aborigines Protection Law Amendment Bill.*

[ASSEMBLY] December 15, 1886 [Page 2912]

**ABORIGINES PROTECTION LAW AMENDMENT BILL.**

Mr. DEAKIN moved that this Bill be read a second time. He explained that the object of the measure was to carry out certain recommendations of the Board for the Protection of the Aborigines. It provided for the reservation of the aboriginal stations only for the aborigines and those half-castes and others who, from their intimate connexion, could not now be dissevered from them. It also provided for the licensing out of half-castes by the board, so that they might be educated to earn their own living. It provided, further, that half-castes in necessitous circumstances should be supplied with rations or their equivalent in money for three years, with clothing for five years, and with blankets for seven years. With the help of such provision, it was believed that the half-castes would gradually cease to be a burden upon the State.

**Clause 5** authorized, in the case of aborigines guilty of breaches of discipline, their removal from the station where they were located, and the forfeiture of the whole or any part of their rations and allowances, but it was intended to amend this provision in committee so that it would be necessary to have the consent of the Governor in Council before the authority was exercised. (Mr. McLean – “Clause 5 had better be omitted.”). He had no objection. He might add that the Bill was not a Government Bill; it was the Bill of the board; and it was introduced chiefly with the object of making the half-castes useful members of society, and gradually relieving the State of the cost of their maintenance.

Mr. McLEAN said he strongly approved the main objects of the Bill. As the Chief Secretary had explained, the measure carried out the recommendations of the Board for the Protection of the Aborigines, which he believed represented the unanimous wish of the people of the country with regard to the half-castes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was then read a second time, and committed.

**Clause 5 was struck out.**

On **clause 11**, providing that any able-bodied half-caste found lodging, living, or wandering in company with any aboriginal, and not being able to

give a good account of himself, should be deemed an idle and disorderly person, and liable to imprisonment for any time not exceeding twelve months, with or without hard labour,

Mr. BENT objected to the clause, and said he doubted very much whether the Board for the Protection of the Aborigines was doing the thing it ought to do.

**The clause was struck out.**

**Clause 12**, empowering an adjudicating justice to decide, on his own view and judgement, whether a person brought before him was an aboriginal or an aboriginal half-caste, **was also struck out.**

The remaining clauses were passed by the mention of the numbers.

Mr. BROWN observed that he had heard before of hasty legislation, but he did not thoroughly understand what it meant till now. He called this hasty legislation with a vengeance, and he entered his protest against it.

Mr. CARTER considered it a travesty on legislation. The country had done without the Bill for a great many years, and it could not matter much if it was postponed for another six months. He objected to the Government refraining from proceeding with Bills until the last moments of the session, and then rushing them through in this indecent manner. If anybody objected

to a clause, it was struck out without discussion; but if a clause was so immaterial, why was it contained in the Bill? This sort of legislation was a disgrace to Parliament. It would be far better to pass one Bill properly than to pass a dozen in this fashion.

The Bill was reported with amendments, and the report was adopted.

On the motion of Mr. DEAKIN, the Bill was then read a third time and passed.