

**HON. H. J. SAUNDERS:** Last session this House in its wisdom threw out the amendments proposed by Mr. Hackett; and I think if the House had not done that, but had passed those amendments, and if the amendments had been submitted to the vote of the people, the hands of the Government would have been much strengthened, and we probably would have obtained certain concessions. But, as you know, there were two or three goldfields members who would not have the amendments at any price: it was either the whole Bill or no Bill. There is one matter I am very pleased to notice, with reference to the transcontinental railway. That subject was the great bugbear to my mind against federation. I did not see how we could obtain federation absolutely, unless we were assured we should get that line; but I am glad to see from the correspondence that Mr. Holder has absolutely promised that, as soon as federation is established, he will bring in a Bill for the construction of the line by the Federal Parliament, and pass it stage by stage simultaneously with the passage of a similar Bill in this colony. I consider that is really a very satisfactory arrangement, and I think it gets over my chief objections to federation. Of course, if we could get a five-years tariff to ourselves, that would also be a very good thing, but as far as I can gather, we shall have to trust to the generosity of the other colonies to see that Western Australia does not lose by having joined the federation.

**A MEMBER:** They were very generous over the mail contract, were they not!

**HON. H. J. SAUNDERS:** I have much pleasure in seconding the Address-in-reply.

On motion by **HON. R. S. HAYNES**, debate adjourned until the next sitting day.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

On motion by the **COLONIAL SECRETARY**, the House adjourned at 10 minutes to 4 o'clock, until 4 o'clock on the next Tuesday.

## Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 17th May, 1900.

Opening of Special Session (Federation) - Message  
Opening Speech - Election Return - Papers presented - Leader of the Opposition - Address-in-Reply to opening Speech (moved) - Adjournment.

### OPENING OF SPECIAL SESSION— FEDERATION.

The Legislative Assembly met at 10 o'clock, p.m., pursuant to Proclamation by His Excellency the Administrator, which Proclamation was read by the Clerk.

**THE SPEAKER** (Sir James G. Lee Steere, K.C.M.G.) took the Chair.

#### MESSAGE—OPENING SPEECH.

Black Rod having appeared at the Bar and delivered a summons from the Administrator,

**MR. SPEAKER** and hon. members repaired to the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency delivered a Speech on the opening of the fifth session of the third Parliament. [*Vide p. ante.*] Mr. Speaker and hon. members returned to the Assembly Chamber, and the business of the special session was then proceeded with. Several notices of questions to Ministers, and two notices of motion, were given for the next sitting.

#### ELECTION RETURN.

**THE SPEAKER** announced that during the recess the member for the Ashburton (Hon. S. Burt, Q.C.) had resigned his seat (visiting England), and that the return of writ for an election showed that Mr. David Forrest had been duly elected to represent the Ashburton electoral district.

**MR. D. FORREST**, introduced by the Premier and Mr. Monger, then took the oath and signed the roll.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **SPEAKER**: Public Accounts for financial year 1898-9, accompanied by Report of Auditor General.

By the **PREMIER**: 1, Report of Collector of Customs, 1899; 2, Report by Government Actuary on Manifesto of Eastern Goldfields Reform League; Petition to Her Majesty from Residents

of Eastern Goldfields, together with a Refutation (by the Premier) of Statements in the Petition; 4, Petition to Her Majesty from residents of Albany, together with a Report (by the Premier) of Statements made therein; 5, Copy of Instructions issued to Mr. S. H. Parker, Q.C., as London Representative of Government, *re* passage of Commonwealth Bill through Imperial Parliament, together with further correspondence *re* position of colony in regard to federation.

By MINISTER OF MINES: 1, Regulations under Sluicing and Dredging for Gold Act; 2, Regulations for granting Certificates to Mining Engine-drivers, under Mines Regulation Act Amendment Act.

Ordered to lie on the table.

#### LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): I have to announce to the House that I no longer occupy the position which I did in this House last session, namely that of leader of the Opposition; and I desire to say that Mr. Illingworth, the member for Central Murchison, has been elected to fill that position in my place.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir John Forrest): I should like to express my regret that my friend, the member for Albany, has felt it his duty to resign the position of leader of the Opposition. All of us in this House regret the necessity for his taking that step, because although we say many hard things of one another, on this and on the other side of the House, still I think we compare favourably with any other Legislature in Australia in the goodwill and respect we have for one another. As to the member for Albany, I am sure everyone on this side of the House has a great regard for him, personally; and we very much regret that he has felt it his duty—I am sure he would not have done it if he had not felt it his duty—to relinquish the position of leader of the Opposition. In regard to the new leader on that side, I feel sure the most amicable relations will continue between myself and himself, also between members on that side of the House and supporters of the Government. We have only one object in view in this House, and that is to get the business done as quickly as possible, and to do our best for the colony. The duty of the Opposi-

tion, no doubt, is to criticise; and if it does not inaugurate legislation on any large question, though there is no reason why it should not, its duty is to criticise, and if there are any weak places in the armour of the Government, it is the duty of the Opposition to probe them. This can be done without being personal, and without being unnecessarily offensive; and, of course, we all desire to avoid that. I know we sometimes overstep the mark a little, and I confess I am not altogether free from that imputation; but we do not wish to do it, and after having done it, we regret it. I feel certain that under the leadership of my friend the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth), we will get on fairly well, and that we will always have before our minds what is best for the advancement of this colony.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): I desire to thank the right hon. the Premier for the way in which he has been pleased to refer to myself; also to say it will be my pleasure, as it is my duty, to endeavour on this side of the House to further the business in all possible ways, and to assist the Government in all departments of work in connection with this House, and in passing measures that this side of the House may think will be for the good of the country at large. I may say that the retirement of Mr. Leake from the leadership of the Opposition is a purely voluntary act on his part, and is not caused by any dissension in the party; that he leaves the position, as far as hon. members on this side are concerned; with very great regret, and no dissension whatever has led to this change. It is a purely personal matter with the hon. member, and we all regret as much as the Premier regrets that the change has been thought by him to be necessary. I can assure the Premier and the House that I shall be ready to assist the House, and that hon. members on this side will assist in all good legislation that is for the benefit of the country.

#### FEDERATION ENABLING BILL.

THE PREMIER, on leave given, introduced the Federation of Australia Enabling Bill, providing for the taking of a referendum vote of the people in Western Australia.

Bill read a first time.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time on Wednesday next. I have the Bill ready on the table, printed; but from some information I have received by cablegram from London, since I came into the House, I think it is undesirable to place the Bill on the table until I have considered the effect which that information may have in regard to the Bill.

Question put and passed, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for the next Wednesday.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY TO OPENING SPEECH.

THE SPEAKER informed the House that he, with hon. members, had attended His Excellency the Administrator in the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the opening Speech of the session. Having obtained a copy of the speech, for greater accuracy, he read the same to the House.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): Mr. Speaker, it has been allotted to me to move the Address-in-reply to this very short Speech of the Governor; and although it is a short Speech, the shortest perhaps ever presented to this Assembly, hon. members will agree with me that it is pregnant with more vital issues to this colony than any other address which the Governor has delivered. This is the second occasion on which this House has been called to consider the great question of Australian federation, and it would seem now that possibly we have reached the last stage of this great agitation, the last stage of this great movement. Much abuse has been hurled at this Chamber, and at another place—at Parliament, let me say—by some persons throughout this colony for what has been called undue interference with the rights of the people. This afternoon I propose to defend this Parliament, to the best of my ability, and to endeavour to prove that Parliament has acted constitutionally, and has never overstepped, in a single instance, its rights. Whatever has been done has been for the best, no matter what the result in the future may be; and no one in this Chamber, or in the other branch of Parliament, has gone outside the privileges which were conferred upon him when he was sent to Parliament by his constituents. It was only known to me,

or rather I was only asked and consented to move the Address-in-reply last evening; therefore I have not had a lengthy period in which to consider the question: still I have given the whole of my time since then to a study of the subject, and I shall endeavour to prove that constitutionally, historically, and on the grounds of equity and justice, Parliament has acted wisely in the past, it has acted well, and altogether in accordance with the privileges of this Parliament. It will be my task to endeavour to refute, with all the power of which I am possessed, the accusations levelled against Parliament by persons in this colony, and more so by people outside of this colony. This is not the last session of this Parliament, for we shall have another session in a few weeks' time—inside a month or so, at least we may presume so; still we may call this the last session, the last year at any rate, during which Parliament will meet, and many of us may not have an opportunity of referring to this question again; some of us may not be sent back here; consequently there will not be an opportunity of considering this question with a free hand again. I propose to analyse the question raised by the federal leaders, that the Parliament of this colony had no right to interfere with the Commonwealth Bill. Let me premise my remarks by stating that I deeply regret that Parliament saw fit to elect the delegates from this colony, and that they were not elected by the people. I stated this at the time, and I declined in Parliament to vote for any delegate going from Parliament. Since then I have never seen fit to change my opinion. All must agree with me that it was a fatal mistake to make: it would have been far better to have put this question before the people of the colony in the first instance, and thus have taken an opportunity of educating the people on federal matters. If that had been done, men would have been sent to the Federal Conventions who would have been able to speak with authority. That was the initial error, and a great deal of trouble has arisen since from that mistake. The House will agree with me that the question of federation has not been considered in Western Australia yet. Unfortunately, the main issues of the great question have been lost sight of in the cry for the referendum. The cry became so

overwhelming that it swept away the resistance of Parliament, and, what is more to be wondered at, it swept away the resistance of another place whose special interest it is to look after the landed property of the country and to check hasty legislation. We have to vindicate ourselves. We are told by the Premier, and we believe him, that all hope of getting the amendments has gone; and the Premier has acted, as I am prepared always to believe, in the best interests of the country. It has been said that because we sent delegates in the past to the Conventions to assist in the framing of a Federal Bill, this country and Parliament are bound to accept the Bill. That is not true. There is not a single instance historically to bear out that statement. There is no reason constitutionally to say that because delegates went to the Federal Conventions and helped to frame the Commonwealth Bill, therefore the Parliament and the people are bound to accept that Bill. We had the temerity to criticise the measure from the standpoint of Western Australia: we had the temerity to propose amendments to it, so as to further the interests and prosperity of Western Australia. We only did what was done in the other Australian colonies, and in meeting here twice to consider the Commonwealth Bill, we are only doing what New South Wales and the other colonies did, notably New South Wales. The Parliament of that colony interfered with the Commonwealth Bill, and with the will of the people, in inserting a minority vote in the Enabling Bill. That is the reason the people say that a minority vote should be insisted upon, that a certain number at least should vote in favour of federation. Therefore, we have done nothing extraordinary in asking for the amendments. In looking at this question, we must be guided by the Canadian Federation, because the United States Federation does not offer the same analogy as that of Canada. There is a marvellous similarity between the federation of Canada and of Australia, and in the history of the Canadian Federation we must look for a vindication and a justification of the steps taken by this Parliament in the past. When the different States of Canada agreed to federate, delegates met in conference at Charlottetown and then

at Quebec. There were delegates at those meetings from Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward's Island. The delegates met in the same way as the delegates in Australia met; there were five or six provinces represented, five at the last meeting. The delegates met in conference and drafted 72 resolutions, embodying what afterwards became the constitution of Canada. The delegates then went back to their respective Parliaments and submitted the resolutions, which contained in them all that afterwards became the constitution of the union. What happened? The resolutions were adopted in Canada, which afterwards became two States. After some little trouble New Brunswick and Nova Scotia did the same, but Newfoundland and Prince Edward's Island, which had sent delegates to the meetings, did not adopt the constitution: they rejected it. The Parliament rejected it a first time and a second time, and these two States remained out of the union for the time being. That goes to prove that we are not the first country to send delegates to conferences, and afterwards that Parliament refuses to ratify what the delegates did there. Nor is it necessary for me to quote historical instances in support of what I say. What is the use of referring matters to Parliament afterwards, if the voice of Parliament is not to be supreme? Wherein lies the reason for the vile abuse against this Parliament for doing what every other Parliament in Australia has done, and what these two States in Canada did? These two States remained out, with what result? With the result that I am sorry to say we are not going to have. The similarity of Western Australia and those Canadian States that stopped out of the union I am afraid is going to cease here. Those States stopped out, as I can prove without the shadow of contradiction, and got what they asked for before they went in—gigantic concessions in some cases. Western Australia was in the same position as British Columbia. We dared to think the interests of the people were not safeguarded; we were losing too much; we were giving away more than any other Australian colony if we went into the federation. We voted a committee and asked for an alteration in the

Constitution, with what result we are here to-day to decide. The Government have decided to take a certain step, and they must be supported by the Opposition; but, as I said, the similarity between the Canadian States and Western Australia is about to cease. I think the case of Western Australia would have ended as successfully as that of British Columbia and Prince Edward's Island, if there had been greater unanimity. There was greater unanimity in British Columbia and Prince Edward's Island than in this country, where there have been two parties. There was a difference of opinion, one party saying the Bill was satisfactory to them, and the other saying it was not satisfactory. There has not been that unanimity in public opinion in Western Australia which existed in the two States of Canada: whether that be for the fortune or misfortune of Western Australia, I do not say; but I hold that it was a calamity for Western Australia not to be unanimous in demanding those small concessions, because if there had been unanimity, despite the opposition of the Australian Parliaments, Mr. Chamberlain would have altered the Bill. If there had been union in our camp, we should have got the alterations, and we should have triumphed and obtained the concessions; therefore I say the difference of opinions has been a calamity to Western Australia. It is somewhat startling to read through the history of the Canadian union and find what great similarity and what a great parallel there is between the case of Western Australia and the case of Prince Edward's Island and British Columbia. In Prince Edward's Island the people would not have federation. After having sent delegates to the conferences, a resolution was passed in the Parliament that no union with Canada would be satisfactory because it would take away their autonomy; and, more, that they were not connected by traversable land, but by a frozen sea during some part of the year, and that they were not an integral part of the Canadian Dominion as the other States were. It may be said we are not a part of the Australian Continent in the same sense as the Eastern colonies are. No one can tell me that we are in the same position as the other colonies are. No one can fail to see the immense difference of position

of this colony from the other colonies. The one main river of Australia runs from the Darling Downs right through New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia. It is impossible to say where the boundaries of those colonies are: nature has placed no boundaries between the other colonies, but nature has placed an impassable boundary between Western Australia and the Eastern colonies. That is the reason why this Parliament had the right to look at the Commonwealth Bill in a manner different from the other colonies. We have been separated, are separated still, and will be separated for some years to come, if I am not a bad judge of the future, by an impassable desert. Had it been a mere stretch of water, it would have been crossed long ago and vessels would have been plying on it; but there is nothing so impassable as an inhospitable, arid, and barren desert which can only be traversed in one way, by the iron horse. I now come to the second instance. What greater example and parallel could be found in two parts of the world than exists to-day, and always will exist, between British Columbia and Western Australia. One great reason given for our holding out of the federation was that advanced by the member for North-East Coolgardie, and was the same as that given by British Columbia, that, like ourselves, it was separated by a vast desert. The reason that British Columbia remained out of the union was because it was not connected with the settled parts of Canada: it was separated by a continent: there was an unknown wilderness between Canada and British Columbia. I will show also that Prince Edward's Island remained out of the union with advantage to herself; that those people got into financial trouble and then said to Canada: "If you like to guarantee us, if you like to give us special concessions, we will consider entering into your union." It was called the "better terms arrangement." That is a significant term in connection with Western Australia. We asked for better terms, and so did Prince Edward's Island. Canada consented to give these better terms, to give the guarantee and money grants which were quite sufficient to induce that State to change its opinion, to adopt the Union, and to throw in its lot with Canada. That is one case which is very much like

ours; but the case of British Columbia is even more like ours, and I intend to show it is exactly on all-fours with the amendments asked for by the Joint Select Committee; exactly identical with the concessions asked for by British Columbia, and which she got, and more besides. In dealing with these historical facts, we claim to have precedent on our side; we claim to have precedent as to the concessions asked for, as well as precedent for the powers exercised by this Parliament on the question in the last session. British Columbia saw that she was not on the world's highway of commerce, the same as Western Australia has seen. British Columbia asked for a guarantee of the construction of a transcontinental railway from Canada right into her own port. She got that gigantic concession, costing millions of money, and British Columbia was by that means placed on the highway of the world's commerce, and she is to-day an important spot on one of the world's great highways of traffic. She is a distributing centre. She is to-day the most important British possession on the western seaboard of the North American Continent; and it is hard to tell what her future may not be. She has a magnificent railway across the continent; but she asked also for the guarantee of the construction of a graving dock, because she saw the importance of being the naval station for the western side of Canada, the same as we in this colony do in regard to the western side of Australia. She asked for, and she obtained, what should have been asked for by Western Australia. The first concession asked for by British Columbia was the railway across the continent, and she got it. We have asked for a railway to connect us with the Eastern States of Australia; but what have we got? We have got an assurance from a Premier; an assurance which seems to have satisfied the Government here, but is not enough to satisfy me. Had there been any chance of getting more than that, I would have considered the promise of Mr. Holder as not worth more than a snap of the fingers; for we know what the promises of Governments are worth, and we know what the promises of an Opposition are, or even the promises of a Parliament. Promises given by the head of a Ministry may hold good while

the Parliament or the Ministry lasts; but who is to guarantee the fulfilment of any such promise after a new Ministry comes in? If this question comes up again, the people of South Australia may find it very convenient not to allow commerce to pass Adelaide and come to Perth; and therefore, though this promise may be enough to satisfy the Government of this colony at present, and even to satisfy a majority of this House, yet history tells us that British Columbia got a railway constructed and completed, also got a graving dock, and that these were not mere promises, but accomplished facts. It has been said by the federal leader in this House, and by federal leaders in the Eastern colonies—and in fact they made a large mouthful of it—that you cannot have a federal union whilst you have Customs duties between the different States. Politicians in the Eastern colonies offered us in the Bill, in exchange for five years of fiscal freedom, something that is self-destructive, that must destroy itself within a year or two. What did British Columbia get? She secured the construction of a transcontinental railway; she also got a graving dock made; and she got her customs duties continued to her until the railway was completed. It would appear that if you look from end to end of history, you cannot find two instances more parallel than those of British Columbia and Western Australia in regard to federation. British Columbia asked for her customs duties to be continued: she stipulated that she must have a railway across the continent, and must have her customs duties continued until the railway was completed. When the railway was finished, she said she wanted more; that being so far removed from the military capital of the Canadian Federation, she must have a naval station to protect her on the Pacific Ocean; and she got that also. Hon. members may find, by historical research, what else that colony and other colonies got as the result of not federating on the terms first offered, but waiting till they got better terms.

MR. JAMES: I do not call that "historical research." We read it years ago.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: From whom did they get those concessions? From the federating colonies.

MR. MORAN: That is a very happy thought of the hon. member.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They did not make conditions to enter as original States.

MR. MORAN: I say that Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland sent delegates to the Federal Conventions in Canada, and I say their cases are exactly like that of Western Australia. I want every phase of this question to be argued out, because I am here to-day to vindicate the action of this Parliament, as a Parliament, in having striven to do what has been so successfully done in other parts of the world. I read that Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland sent delegates to the Conventions in Canada, but that those States did not enter the Union at that time, and did not avail themselves of the terms offered to them to enter as original States.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They did not make conditions then.

MR. MORAN: I repeat, those colonies got what they asked for. They stood out because they thought they were entitled to something more than was offered; and I say that Western Australia, through the disloyalty of some of her sons, has been unable to get that justice done to her which has been admitted by the federal leaders here, and by those in the Eastern colonies whom the federalists here profess to follow, to be her due. Now, as to the course taken by the Government on this question, I ask, what has been done? Hon. members have a copy of the instructions given to Mr. Parker when he went to London as the delegate acting under the authority of the Government of Western Australia. Members have also before them other papers showing the efforts of the Government, as the Executive of Parliament, in endeavouring to get the Premiers of the Eastern colonies to do what they themselves admitted to be a simple act of justice. Now I come to the reason why those Premiers in the Eastern colonies did not make the concessions asked for on behalf of Western Australia. The Premier (Sir J. Forrest) has just handed to me a copy of some of the words used by Mr. Chamberlain, in introducing the Australian Federation Bill in the British Parliament.

THE PREMIER: That is the substance of it.

MR. JAMES: Who gave the information? The Government.

MR. MORAN: I intend to show that it has been through the agency of the Federal League in Western Australia that we have failed to get these concessions. Surely I am not misstating the fact, and I give those persons the credit of honestly thinking these amendments were not necessary; but I say that through their agency Western Australia is going into the Federal Union on conditions which every leader in the Eastern colonies has admitted to be such that Western Australia must suffer by accepting them; and, in addition, we have now the words of the Secretary of State (Mr. Chamberlain), who must have some idea of what will be injurious to a small colony like this on joining the Eastern colonies in a federal union upon such terms as have been offered to us in the Bill. Every leader in the Eastern colonies has admitted that Western Australia is in an exceptional position, and the reasons given for that opinion are known to every federalist in this House. The Bill offers us what those politicians in the Eastern colonies considered to be a compromise, and they said, "Here are your concessions, and they are sufficient for you: they will level up matters." What did the federal party say in Western Australia? They have never attempted to suggest any original idea, but they sing out loudly for what those in the Eastern States say is enough for us. The federal party here stick manfully to the cry of "Referendum!" They never endeavour to explain federation at all. We now see that they have won on the cry of "Referendum": it has smothered everything else. It has brow-beaten the members of the Upper House when they went before their constituents; and, shall I say it—I suppose I may as well say it, because others will do so—it has frightened the Government of Western Australia. Now we will come to the federal party and the Opposition in this House, because they are in the same league together. This has been a party question all through, and it remains to be seen who will come up afterwards. They have made federation a party question.

MR. JAMES: No.

MR. MORAN: I say they have made federation a party question; and by their persistency, by their public meetings all over the colony, and by the noisiest of agitations they let it be known in the Eastern colonies that this colony was divided on the matter; they let it be known that they were actuated by the greatest animosity towards the present Government; and they never spoke about federation without at the same time crying "Anathema" to the Forrest Government! It was equally "Hallelujah" for federation and the Opposition, and down with the Forrest Government."

MR. VOSPER: That is their composition, their mixture.

MR. MORAN: Yes; and it is a very good mixture; but I notice the hon. member did not partake much of it himself. It is on the federal party we must lay the blame of making the Premiers in the Eastern colonies to stand firm in refusing the concessions asked for on behalf of this colony. Had the people here been united, those Premiers would not have refused these concessions.

MR. EWING: How do you know that?

MR. MORAN: We know the party here did not stand firm. Anyhow, the party here struck their colours; or, if they did stand firm, it was the kind of firmness described by the member for East Perth, who said the federal party were not going to concede to the agricultural party, who had the soul of a potato and the heart of a cabbage. This cry of "the Bill to the people" has been effective. Its torrent is overwhelming at the present moment; and let it be recorded in history that had Western Australia stood together, we would have obtained the reasonable concessions we asked for. The future alone can tell whether we have or have not been in the wrong, and whether Western Australia will suffer at all from federating on the terms offered in the Bill; but it may be that, in the future, the people of this colony will rise up and say, "We have no revenue: we cannot manage our own affairs." Then who will have brought that about? Our people did not keep together, for if the Legislature had kept together, the people would have kept together too. Had this Parliament been united, we should have been enabled, I am certain, to get the

small alterations which have been asked for made in the Bill. I come now to the fetish, the wooden idol in the Bill, the fetish which has been held aloft by the federal leaders in the Eastern colonies, that the Government was not to tamper with the Bill in one single iota. What was it? "The Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill," That has been their cry, and they have cried themselves hoarse against our Parliament's endeavouring to arrogate to itself the right to alter the Bill. The other colonies sent delegates to London, and they are waxing wroth just now, waxing abusive in my opinion, because the Secretary of State in the head Government of the British Empire dares to interfere with and alter the Bill. They are abusive. We read last night of Mr. Symons, in South Australia, abusing everyone, practically, most roundly, and now he is going to vote for Mr. Kingston for the Upper House at the next elections. Oil and water are to mix together, the lion and the lamb are to lie down together, because Mr. Chamberlain is going to alter the Bill. Anyone would think that Mr. Symons had a personal interest in the matter, but I am wrong because lawyers never have. Our friends the federalists are in a sort of a quandary, they feel it, they squirm under it. They have got a very unpleasant dose before them: they have got to swallow everything they have said about not altering the sacred scroll of the people. What a lot they will have to swallow, because Mr. Chamberlain is going to alter the Bill! And he is not going to make a small alteration like Western Australia wanted; Mr. Chamberlain is not simply going to clip the wing of the fetish: he is not going to take an arm or a foot off, but he is going to decapitate it: he is going to take the head off this wooden fetish which is so adored by the federalists. Answer me this question: Is not the interpretation of the law the very crown and basis of that law? You may make laws, that is one thing, but the coping-stone of any legal system is its interpretation, surely so! Mr. Chamberlain is not only going to alter the Bill, but he is going to alter the very vital portions of the Bill. Instead of having a tribunal in Australia, he is going to remove the venue home to England, to the Privy Council, and the final interpretation is to be made in



England. A more important alteration could not be made in the Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Is that correct?

MR. JAMES: No.

MR. MORAN: Is Mr. Campbell-Bannerman to be successful in defeating Mr. Chamberlain? If the Government of England at the present day is to be defeated over that amendment, then the delegates will be triumphant. We all know that Mr. Chamberlain has made up his mind, notwithstanding the threats of Mr. Barton, the almost threats of Mr. Kingston. What will happen? *Mirabile dictu!* will there be a revolution in Australia, as predicted by Mr. Walter Griffiths? He is an important personage in Australia, he has taken upon himself to represent the whole of Australia, and he says there will be a revolution if the Bill is altered. But Mr. Chamberlain goes on the even tenor of his way, and has decided to alter it: he will alter the Bill notwithstanding the great lawyers of Australia. What is the only argument urged by the people of Eastern Australia against our alterations? The correspondence is here and will show the reason. Why did every one of the Premiers refuse to consent to Western Australia's small alterations? Why did Turner and Holder, and all the big leaders, refuse to give us our small concessions? They all gave the stereotyped answer, "We have not the power; we have no power to alter the Bill or agree to any amendment." It was the work of the people, and must be adopted as a whole as the people have accepted it. If any alterations be made, the Bill will have to be sent to the people again to agree to it. I am going to await with interest the evolutions of Mr. Barton and his colleagues. Will they swallow all they have said and accept the Bill as altered? Will they arrogate to themselves the sacred rights of the electors in the Eastern colonies? Or will they say the Bill must go back to the electors for further sanction to those vital alterations? What will they do? If I thought, and I say it now plainly and openly, that they will stand to their words, and not swallow their own utterances, if they are going for another referendum, I should stand in this House and refuse to allow any Bill to go anywhere until the people in the Eastern colonies have decided on a new referendum?

But I know they are not going to have a new referendum; they are going to besmirch their fair reputations. Why, will not Mr. Barton agree to a referendum? There was a meeting of Premiers the other day. Mr. Lyne, Mr. Turner, and others were there. What did they do? "Good day, Lyne." "Good day, Turner." "What are you here for?" "Nothing." "Then good day," and they go home, as they had no power to accept alterations. The delegates and the Premiers will swallow the amendments, they will gorge them all, they will get them all down, and what will the result be? They will accept the Bill and have no more referendum. For a good reason the authorities in New South Wales and Queensland are not "game" to face another referendum.

MR. EWING: How do you know that? Can you justify that expression?

MR. MORAN: I feel sure those colonies will not trust to another referendum: they will hold on to what they have.

MR. EWING: I do not see that this is justifying it.

MR. MORAN: The Premiers said, when they met together, "It will never do to go to the people again: we will hold to what we have got, or another vote may be against federation." Queensland accepted the Bill by only a very small majority; and the federalists say, "We must not have another referendum: we dare not trust the people."

MR. KINGSMILL: You would not trust them once.

MR. MORAN: Before hon. members talk about being afraid to trust anyone, they should await the result of this debate. I say there will be no other referendum, the other colonies will not be "game" to have one: they will hold to what they have got, as they will be afraid of some States slipping out. In the future, if Western Australia should suffer from entering the federal union, if we should suffer from want of revenue through the absence of the five-years fiscal freedom, if we should suffer through not getting the transcontinental railway line, if our coal mines should be hampered by not being helped along with special railway rates, the federal party in Western Australia will not receive the same rounds of applause and acclamation they are receiving to-day.

A MEMBER: They will all be gone.

MR. MORAN: Unless they die very young, they will live to see the necessity of the protection Western Australia is asking for. I am afraid they will not die young. I have endeavoured to vindicate the position of this Parliament, to show that we have done nothing which should not have been done. Parliament is supreme, and we have endeavoured to do what history has taught us to do, and what has been put into our minds by the federal leaders themselves. We have endeavoured to do what Mr. Chamberlain himself tried to do, only for the adamant front of the delegates at home, backed up by the federal leaders out here. I have shown that we have endeavoured to do what was done in British Columbia and Prince Edward's Island. What did Mr. Chamberlain say: "He considered conditions proposed Federal Act likely to cause strain in financial matters Western Australia, and he did not envy Chancellor of Exchequer who would be consequently tied by statute, as it will interfere with annual estimates." There is no getting away from that fact. This in itself is a complete vindication of the noble efforts made by certain people in Western Australia to protect this colony—

MR. KINGSMILL: From itself.

MR. MORAN: Not from itself, but from those disloyal sons who would not fall in with the demands made by Western Australia. We are here to-day to present an Address-in-reply to His Excellency, whose Ministers have decided that they have done all they can do to get concessions. Have hon. members read the telegrams of the Secretary of State? He says, "I would like to have helped you, but I cannot." I admit the greatest factor in calling us together to-day has been the overwhelming cry in the country for the referendum. We have never had a federal campaign in the colony yet, but the people cannot be denied—it looks as if they will not be denied—a voice in the affairs of the country, which is quite right. The quite wrong part has been the influencing of the passions of the people, and by mixing up party politics with federation. We are sending the Bill to the people now, but I am afraid of this: we will not get a

clear, calm, deliberative, reflective vote on the question.

MR. EWING: You ought to have done it before.

MR. MORAN: I think the agitation has suffered to a great extent, I know it has in my part of the country, and to such an extent that federation has been obliterated, and the Bill will go to people who are imbued with the idea that they are dealing a death-blow at the old settlers of Western Australia, at the Swan River oligarchy. That feeling exists, and it is extremely bitter. We have seen how bitter it is in the cry for separation—the most extravagant cry ever raised in any part of the world; a cry with less real merit in it than any other political cry ever raised; a cry to build an empire, a nation, on one industry; a cry to build Parliament Houses, to borrow money for public works, to provide all the requirements of a State which is to exist for ever on one industry, and that industry an evanescent one; an industry that does not count for so much to-day as it did a few months ago, and even the great Kalgoorlie is not half as wealthy to-day as when she started that cry for separation; an industry which, as an asset in the market, goes down 12 millions in a few months! [Mr. Ewing interjected a remark.] I have not yet learnt to prostitute my intellect, to pander to popular clamour, to every passing breeze that blows. If I think a political scheme is impracticable, I shall say so and take the consequences. From the popular breeze on which the separation advocates are now soaring, they will probably flop down, and that will be the last of them. This bitter cry for separation has been worked up by certain newspapers in the colony, so that we are not likely to get a calm and deliberate vote on this great question of federation. If we agree to carry the present proposal for sending the Bill to the people, I ask every member of the House that he will not sit still during the federation campaign, but to remember that it is a sacred duty cast on our shoulders to say what we think, regardless altogether of consequences to ourselves, politically. I have given this question the closest study, I understand the Bill fairly well, and I am prepared to argue the question publicly against federation, as far as I can see now.

I am prepared to argue against the people going into federation on the terms of the Bill; and I am prepared to argue this with any man in Western Australia, at any place and at any time. I do ask members of the House that they will put their views calmly and deliberately before the electors, in such a way that the question may altogether lose its party character; that there shall be no altercation or recrimination of a party or personal character, but that each member will go before his constituents, or in any other place that he may, and explain the Federal Bill as it is presented to us, and make its meaning clear to the best of his ability; asking the people to give a calm and deliberate vote, apart altogether from party politics; asking them to forget, if they can, the question of the Forrest Government or the Illingworth Opposition; asking them to forget the question of the old settlers near the coast as against the new settlers on the gold-fields; asking them to give a calm, a rational, and a patriotic vote on the question, in the best interests of Western Australia: resting assured that if they do so, and if the verdict of the people be such as I hope it will be, they will agree that it will be well for us at the present time to keep out of the Federal Union, in order that we may get better terms in the future. The man who says we shall be penalised if we do not go into the Federal Union now is ignoring the teaching of history. Was Maryland penalised, was Rhode Island penalised, because it did not go into the federation of the United States? Surely, if our people think they are not being properly protected, it is a very unfederal idea to think the Eastern colonies will band together to punish us for exercising our rights as British subjects! I shall hope that every man will give his view on the question, Is federation necessary? and, if so, are we making sufficient sacrifice or are we making too much? There is the alternative that, if we are making too much sacrifice, we have the examples of States which have stood out of a Federal Union for a time, and have made better terms before entering it. Thanking the House warmly and heartily for their attentive hearing this afternoon, I may say in conclusion that I have had imposed on me the task of, to a certain extent, defending what has been

done in the past, and no doubt a party aspect has been imparted to the federal question. The Government took a certain line of action, and there is no doubt we are now vindicating what has been done in the past. We have arrived now at a stage when all will be agreed. I thank hon. members for their attention, and I beg to move the adoption of a short Address-in-reply, as follows:—

To His Excellency Sir Alexander Campbell Onslow, Knight, Administrator of the Government in and over the Colony of Western Australia and its Dependencies, etc., etc., etc.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

We, the members of the Legislative Assembly, beg to assure you of our loyalty and devotion to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen. We will carefully consider the special matter, as well as all others that may be submitted to us by Your Excellency, and it shall be always our earnest endeavour to promote the best interests of this portion of Her Majesty's Dominions.

MR. PHILLIPS (Irwin): I have much pleasure in rising to second the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. Before doing so, I must congratulate my friend, the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran), on his able speech. Personally, I am opposed to federation at this time, on the present Commonwealth Bill, because I fully believe that if we are allowed to manage our own affairs for a few more years it will be better for the colony. I had hoped the reasonable concessions recommended by the Joint Select Committee on the Commonwealth Bill would have been agreed to; but as these have not been agreed to, I feel justified in saying we should no longer keep the Bill from being submitted to a vote of the people. I have much pleasure in seconding the Address-in-reply.

On motion by MR. ILLINGWORTH, debate adjourned until the next sitting day.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

On motion by the PREMIER, the House adjourned at 4.35 o'clock until the next Tuesday at 4.30 o'clock p.m.