

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 23rd September, 1903.

	PAGE
Leave of Absence	1152
Bills: University Endowment, first reading	1152
Merchant Shipping Act Application, first reading	1152
Pearlshell Fishery Act Amendment, third reading	1152
Trans-Australian Railway Enabling, second reading, in Committee, reported	1152

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, leave of absence for one month was granted to the Hon. M. L. Moss on the ground of urgent private business.

UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT BILL.

Introduced by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and read a first time.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT APPLICATION BILL.

Introduced by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and read a first time.

PEARLSHELL FISHERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

TRANS-AUSTRALIAN RAILWAY ENABLING BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill): In moving the second reading of this Bill, one is dealing with a question whose importance to this State for the last two years has rendered the subject almost a household word. It is difficult indeed to find anything new to say on a subject which has engrossed for so long a time the attention of all persons having the welfare, prosperity, and progress of this State at heart. Again, with regard to the Bill itself it is not often we find a measure which contains in itself, as part of itself such an exposition of the reasons which have led to its introduction. Members who have read the preamble to this Bill will have seen that it is concise and clear in form,

which I think must appeal to them, containing the reasons, looked at from every point of view, that have actuated the Government in bringing down the measure. I say that the reasons given in the preamble are those which appeal to the reader from a federal point of view. That there are other reasons I think nobody can gainsay. There are reasons which appeal to us, not in the wider sense as citizens of the Australian Commonwealth, but in the somewhat narrower and more restricted sense as citizens of the State of Western Australia. I do not think even the opponents of this Bill, if there are any in this Chamber, will gainsay for a moment that a Trans-Australian Railway can have anything but the best of effects upon the prosperity of this State. In the first place, the reports which have been furnished to the Government on the country through which the proposed railway will run show that there is a very large amount of pastoral country, described as being really first-class land, which will be opened up and its settlement rendered possible by the construction of this line. Again, and this is far more important, I do not think that anybody can gainsay that an influx of population and the better acquaintance with the resources and inhabitants of Western Australia which must ensue on the completion of a line such as this, will have a splendid effect upon the prosperity of our State. We have suffered for many years past from the effects of isolation. It is not good for a man to live alone, and if it is bad for a man to live alone, it is much worse for the multiplication of men, the population of a State; it is not good for a State to occupy that unenviable position of aloofness which Western Australia has occupied in the past, and from which she is now slowly recovering. I think I repeat the thoughts of all those who have seen much of our State, when I say that all we want to attract population is to be known. We have had very many instances of that lately, and I think perhaps the best instance has been the effect the Federal visit paid here in January last has already had. Anybody who spoke to those gentlemen who came here for the first time could not but be struck, in the first place, with the lack of knowledge

they possessed with regard to the resources and prosperity of Western Australia, and, in the second place, with the agreeable surprise which those resources and which our forward state of development created in their minds. How much greater then will the advantage be to us when, instead of having to brave the journey by sea (and sea journeys are, by the majority of people, things that have to be braved), at any of the stations from Brisbane to Adelaide it will be possible for our neighbours to get aboard a comfortable train and travel in comfort and speed to this land? I feel certain that, with the influence it must have on our industries, the most permanent and one of the most important of our industries, that of land settlement, cannot but be extremely profitable to us. With regard to the subject we are dealing with, members are aware, I presume, of the history of this project. There is not, then, very much need for me to touch upon it at length. Let it suffice to say that Western Australia has, from the time the project was first mentioned, been ever ready to take her part of the burden upon her own shoulders, and to do whatever it was possible to do towards making this railway an accomplished fact. The first important step that was taken, perhaps the first practical step, was about two and a half or three years ago when it was decided to make the flying survey, which was completed, if I remember rightly, about last May two years. That flying survey is, I think, one of the completest of the kind made in Australia, and it rendered invaluable data for the report which followed it, about the prospects both from the engineering point of view and from the point of view of the ultimate success or otherwise of the railway as regards finances. Touching on the report which is formulated from the data obtained from that survey, I cannot but think it is a great tribute to the memory of our late Engineer-in-Chief that, upon reconsideration of this project by all the leading engineers of Australia, in so many details they should have been so close, with regard to the estimated cost of this railway, to the report which was prepared and laid before Parliament by that lamented gentleman. Now, with regard to the Bill itself I think members will agree with me that it could

not have been made very much simpler. What has to be set forth is set forth in a very few words, and words which are easily understood. With regard to a point which has been raised, and which affects Clause 3—the power to take land—it was suggested that perhaps it would be well in this Bill to invest the Commonwealth with the power to acquire private lands for the purpose of building this line. I have made inquiry into this, and the Premier informs me it would be better if they acquired that power by their own legislation. He says the process is simple, and there could be no difficulty about it whatever. I do not propose, therefore, to amend Clause 3 in that direction, nor, according to the advice of the Attorney General, is it necessary that it should be so amended. In Clause 4 we have provision made for the construction by the State of Western Australia, at a time coincident with the construction of the Trans-Australian Railway, of a line of the same gauge and of the same description, running from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. I would venture to say that, whether or not the Trans-Australian line is built within the five years which are mentioned in this Bill, or started within the five years mentioned in the Bill—it is the wish of the majority of the inhabitants of Western Australia that this should be so—there will undoubtedly be need before very long to improve the transport facilities between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, both as regards their carrying capacity and their rate of speed. Already we are running between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie a service which I think may be ranked amongst the fastest 3ft. 6in. gauge services in the world; but the traffic is constantly overtaking the facilities, and we shall have to face the proposition of improving those facilities before very many more years are over our heads; therefore, I think that it is possible the Government may have to take seriously into consideration the question of constructing such a line even before the inception of the Trans-Australian Railway. Furthermore, the appearance of this Bill will, I presume, have a stimulating effect in States other than this, showing that we are willing to bear, at all events, some share of this burden, and it will, I feel certain, act and be regarded as a guarantee of good

faith on the part of Western Australia, and an indication of a desire to keep going that system of taking time by the forelock which has distinguished Western Australia with regard to this project ever since it was first introduced. In Clause 6 will be found what I may describe as the time limit of the operation of this measure. I am sure that most members at all events will be with me in wishing that it will not be necessary for us to re-enact this measure when the time mentioned in Clause 6 has expired. I cannot move the second reading without putting on record the sense of gratitude which I think this State owes to its representatives in the Federal Parliament for having worked so long and so arduously in endeavouring to make the Trans-Australian Railway an accomplished fact. Principally amongst the efforts put forth we must recognise those of Sir John Forrest; and although it may be somewhat out of place as a member of his Cabinet for me to say so, still I cannot fail to recognise too the efforts which our present Premier, both by tongue and pen, has made on behalf of this Trans-Australian line.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: Why did you not bring in this Bill earlier?

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not speak.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill was brought in as soon as it was considered that it would do the greatest amount of good. Possibly if it had been brought in last session the effect which the bringing in would have had might have worn off by this time. Now I think is the opportune time for bringing it in, and that fact is brought home to the Government by the communications which we have received from persons in the Federal Parliament. It is necessary that the Bill should be passed through as quickly as possible, and I anticipate that if there is not a very long debate upon it in this House it will be possible to pass it through all its stages to-day. I do not think I need say any more on the subject, seeing it has been present in the minds of members for such a length of time. I have to commend the Bill to the House as expressing as tersely and as concisely as possible the objects to be aimed at,

and I have now very much pleasure in moving that the Bill be read a second time.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central): I shall be much surprised if a measure of this nature and of such importance is allowed to pass through this Chamber with lightning speed, as the Colonial Secretary contemplates. If there is one justification for the perpetuation of the Legislative Council, it is that the Council exists to check hasty legislation. I have carefully considered the Bill, and come to the conclusion, after looking through other sources of information, that one of its effects is to pledge the credit of this State to the extent of two millions. I ask why should this State undertake such an obligation? The Trans-Australian line is purely a federal matter; it is a matter of federal concern, and it can be constructed by the Federal Government. It was one of the fair promises made to this State previous to our entering Federation that this line should be constructed by the Federal Government. We had a promise from the South Australian Premier that, if we entered Federation, he would allow the line to be constructed through South Australian territory; but this promise, like many more I dare say, remains unfulfilled, and I think this Bill has been brought forward by the leaders of the federal movement, or probably it has been accepted by the leaders of the federal movement, in order to cover up the base perjuries perpetrated during the federal debate. It is Clause 4 which I object to. I consider that clause is foolish and ill-advised. Why should the Government of this State at the present period make any guarantee in this direction? Another thing is that the Colonial Treasurer has not informed us how he is going to finance this scheme. Where is he going to get the money? I think it is the duty of the Government, the duty of the leader of this House, to give information on a matter of this kind before introducing legislation which involves the country in such a heavy liability. It has been stated that this railway is needed for the defence of the Commonwealth. That is a national matter, and if it is needed for the defence of the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth Parliament should construct the line from end to end. There are many other neces-

sary works which should be undertaken by the Government of this State before they shoulder such a heavy burden as the construction of a broad-gauge railway from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. There are, for instance, the Port Hedland to Marble Bar Railway, the Mount Magnet to Lawlers Railway, the Leonora extension, the purchase of the Midland concession, the Collie to Pingelly Railway, and the dock at Fremantle. All these are matters of far more importance than the one under review, especially when we have the right to demand from the Federal Government the construction of this line solely at their own expense. As regards the alteration of the present gauge, this will be a very serious matter to the people of the country. What will it mean? It will mean that the people of the South and the people of the North who wish to send produce to the Kalgoorlie goldfields will be severely penalised. The stuff will have to come to Perth or Midland Junction, and be put on the Kalgoorlie train. This means a heavy charge on the producer, and I think the people of the country districts will protest against an alteration of the gauge on those grounds. It will entirely dislocate our railway system, and I think the Minister's arguments have not been of such a nature as to justify it. I do not think this Bill, if passed in its present form, even with a guarantee for the construction of the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, will affect the position of the South Australian Parliament. How can our passing this measure and our guaranteeing the construction of a broad-gauge line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle influence them? That argument will not weigh with them. They will consider the matter from the point of view of their own interests. We are offering a consideration to the Federal Government for granting us this Commonwealth line; but I maintain that this consideration was given by the people of Western Australia when they agreed to join the Federation, and that should be quite sufficient for the Federal Government. Why should they require us to come forward and expend money to the amount of two millions in helping on the construction of the federal line? I do not propose to say more on the subject, but hope that the measure before

us, and especially Clause 4, will be considered as carefully as possible.

[A pause ensued.]

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): I take it that the fairly obvious reluctance of the House to continue the debate may be accepted as evidence of our agreement with the views put forward by the representative of the Government in this Chamber, and with the argument by which he has supported his application to the House to pass this Bill, and to pass it as speedily as possible. I do not intend to inflict myself at any length on the House, as the matter has been debated in public, in our own Parliament and in the Federal Parliament, on the platform and in the Press, almost *ad nauseam*. Everything to be said in favour of the line has been said, and everything to be said against it has also been urged. With what effect? I think we may all agree that the movement in favour of the line has been gathering strength day by day, and has now obtained overwhelming proportions, and is simply blocked by the unhappy view of the sister State (South Australia) as to the effect this line may have upon its interests. In addition to the names the Colonial Secretary has mentioned, Sir John Forrest and Mr. James—and I must heartily agree with what he has said, especially of what Mr. James has done, for he is doing yeoman service in this matter—I think we should not forget the services of our own members in the Federal Parliament.

HON. G. RANDELL: Some of them.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I do not think any member for this State has indirectly opposed the line, so far as I can gather. They have asserted themselves in the Federal Parliament, and a number of them are at this moment touring through South Australia in order to bring that State to a better idea of what this railway means to it, and of the immense service it will confer on that province. It is almost impossible to add anything in the least degree novel to the arguments in favour of this Bill. I rejoice that the measure is brought forward. It may be a little late in the day, as Mr. Glowrey has pointed out, but I cannot see any good service that could have been rendered by an earlier introduction. It is now called for, and being called for is immediately

brought before the people of Western Australia. I cannot say that all are unanimous on the point, because Mr. Drew will have a lurking doubt about the matter; but I think the rest of the House will agree with the utmost cordiality to send this Bill on its course, as a manifest of our belief in the righteousness of our cause. It is evidence that we intend to keep faith with the obligations we declared and have been declaring for two or three years past, that the State is prepared to assume with regard to the Trans-Australian Railway; evidence that we, at all events, will in the most emphatic manner show to the sister State that the public pledges given by her public men have sunk deep into the hearts of the men of this State, and evidence that, when we received those assurances and largely because of them, we accepted incorporation with the Commonwealth, and trusted their public men as honourable men to be prepared to carry out their part of the bargain, as we are now prepared to carry out ours. The advantages of this railway to the whole of the Commonwealth, to the State, to the coastal parts, and not less to the goldfields, are all most unmistakable, and I need not labour the point; but I desire to point out that, at all events, the charge, sometimes brought up, of the coastal districts favouring their own interests at the expense of the goldfields, can no longer be alleged, for of all the parties to benefit by this undertaking the goldfields people will stand at the head.

MEMBER: What about Fremantle?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Fremantle will gain to some extent, but largely it is appendant to the course of legislation adopted by the Commonwealth Parliament; and I am afraid the service of the railway to Fremantle and her interests will be discounted by the unhappy spirit that seems to prevail in the Federal Parliament, fostered by a gentleman whose name I will not mention at this moment.

HON. G. RANDELL: Sir Malcolm McEacharn?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No; I am not talking of Sir Malcolm McEacharn. I am talking of a gentleman who is anxious that South Australia shall extract all the honey from the flower, but who will not do justice to the Commonwealth as a whole—a gentleman who gave his

word to this State. I would point out that Clause 4 is absolutely essential in the interests of this State. Mr. Drew urged nothing against it except that it would cost two million pounds, and that there were other public works calling for attention in Western Australia. We all agree with those two positions he took up. The broad-gauge line will cost two million pounds, but I venture to say no expenditure of two millions in the State of Western Australia could be more for its benefit than these two millions to construct a broad-gauge railway from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: I am not so sure of that.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The hon. gentleman has the Northern constituencies in view, and has a right to challenge my statements.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: You will have my reasons.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: We will have them in good time. I desire to point out that the construction of this broad-gauge line to Kalgoorlie is absolutely necessary in the financial interests of the State. If the Trans-Australian Railway is constructed, it is necessary that this section to Kalgoorlie should be under the control and remain in the possession of the State Government. The idea always present to my mind, and I believe I am speaking correctly, is that the railway authorities are unanimous that the means of communication between Perth and Fremantle and the goldfields must be increased. They have laid it down as an axiom which cannot be disputed, that the present 3ft. 6in. gauge line, while it can carry on in a sort of way the business between the two places, does so on what would be a loss if we had another pair of rails to quadruple the means of disposing of the traffic. I believe that is absolutely assured. Whether we are to agree to this Bill or not, the question of providing a farther pair of rails to Kalgoorlie will shortly come up for the consideration of the Parliament of this State. That is the ground on which I pin my faith to the fact that this section of 350 miles should be, as soon as possible (and I am going outside the Bill now and following the lead of my hon. friend) taken in hand by this State. If the hon. gentleman will con-

sider the question for one moment, the section of our railway system which runs from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie is, as all know, the best paying. There are those who insist that it is one of the few paying lines, but, at all events, it is the most profitable. The next most profitable section of our railways is the suburban traffic between Midland Junction and Fremantle. Should we take away these two sources of income from our railway system and hand them over to the Federal Government, those resources which include not only the main line traffic, passenger and cargo, between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, but also the suburban traffic in and around Kalgoorlie and the suburban traffic in the metropolitan district, such a hole would be made in the income of the Railway Department that the utmost difficulty would be experienced in carrying on at a profit the business of the State. What would be the result? It is worth while for Mr. Drew and the other gentlemen interested in the agricultural industry of the State to consider the consequences. The producers, and to some extent the consumers, but particularly the producers, would have the railway rates raised on them in the other parts of the system in order to pay for this magnificent gift which, utterly unprovoked, we should hand over to the Federal Parliament if Mr. Drew had his way. I will fight that as long as possible. Let us keep this paying system in our own hands, and enjoy its profits, and develop as far as possible the communication between the coast and the goldfields. It must be remembered that once the Commonwealth Parliament got in with a broad-gauge line of 4ft. 8½in. between Kalgoorlie and Fremantle, it would be to their manifest interest (and they are not fools) to mop up all the trade they could, either in the suburban districts around the capital and Kalgoorlie or on the main line between Fremantle and the goldfields. It is a point that could be enlarged upon at very great length, but I will only add one more point to this aspect of the question. We must have a 4ft. 8½in. gauge between the goldfields and the capital, if it is only for the time that will be saved—I need not speak of the comfort—to those gentlemen who travel on business between the

two places. At present it takes something like 17 hours to make the journey. With a railway constructed on standard gauge, with carriages to match, fitted with all the comforts for sleeping and for dining and for reading, and even with baths, as are supplied on the progressive railways of the world, and not stopping more than absolutely necessary on the road, probably at two or three places, we will be able to negotiate the distance between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie in something like eight or nine hours. That means that one can get into a train at Kalgoorlie at 8 o'clock in the morning and be at Perth at 5 o'clock in the afternoon—a result which it is impossible to achieve with a 3ft. 6in. gauge; so it may even come to this, that we may have to pull up the 3ft. 6in. line, if we can be capable of such stupidity, and lay down a more serviceable line in its place. My idea is that the present line will be left there to serve all that traffic which comes from the country or from the North, and which must be carried without transshipment, and that the 4ft. 8½in. line will be employed for the suburban traffic in the metropolitan and Kalgoorlie districts, and for carrying cargo between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie and so on to the Trans-Australian line. I do not think that I need work at the matter longer. There is so much to be said on this question, and it is so grave a matter both to the Commonwealth and to the State, that one could speak for a very long time on it. But I would point out this general argument in favour of the railway that the connection between Western Australia and the Eastern States of the continent is unique. It is such as is abhorrent to our democratic and patriotic ideas. In other words, the only means of communication between the two sides is at this moment in the hands of private companies, and not only therefore are we at the mercy of the directors of these companies as regards rates and freights, but we are absolutely at their mercy for the very fact of intercourse taking place at all. It is entirely in their power to prohibit any communication whatever, except by telegraph, between the two sides of the Commonwealth. That is a state of things that ought not to be tolerated, and if Australia were a little more federal

in spirit, as we hope she will be in a few years, it would not be listened to. We may take it that a very few years hence it will be the astonishment of the Commonwealth that there should have been any hesitation about this line, and still greater will be the astonishment when it is reflected that South Australia, the State which of all others seems likely to gain most by the construction of the railway, was the principal obstacle. I have the utmost pleasure in warmly supporting this great national and federal undertaking.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM (North): In saying a few words in connection with this very important matter, I do not propose in any way to oppose the Bill; but at the same time I may say I agree to it very reluctantly indeed. And I do so for one of the reasons adduced by Mr. Drew, which is that the building of a Trans-Australian Railway line was one of the considerations held out why we should join the Federation. Therefore, it seems an extraordinary thing that we should have to pay such a large sum of money for joining the Federation. When I uttered that slight interjection just now, which seemed to excite my friend here so much, I simply did so not in the way of opposing the Bill, but because it was said the money was the best two million pounds that could be spent in the State. I do not agree with him in that matter. Still, I think it is a necessary two million pounds, and in my opinion the hon. member need not have laboured the question so much. I do not believe there is a member in this House who will oppose the Bill. Everyone sees the utility of the measure. The only question is how to get the railway constructed. It is unfortunate that there will be a break of gauge, which necessitates our building this portion of it ourselves. It is perfectly correct I think, as Dr. Hackett has said, that it will be impossible to run the service with a 3ft. 6in. gauge; therefore if we are to retain our own revenue we must go to that expense. The two points I wish to refer to are these. It seems most unfair that we should be put to such a large expense for building the railway held out as an inducement to us to join the Federation, and the next objection is that we shall for a long time have a sum of money, two million

pounds, hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles, which will interfere with every loan that is brought forward. There is not the smallest doubt that when we approach the London market or any other to apply for money, they will say: "There is a Bill gone forth; it is on the statutes of the country that they are bound to pay two million pounds as soon as the Federal Government begin to build this railway."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Two millions is an outside estimate.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: Approximately. A very large sum of money will have to be paid, and it will be pointed out that we have agreed to that, and we can be made to pay it at a time when it may be very inconvenient; and with this over us I am quite certain it will not be so easy to borrow money. I only raise my voice now so that members shall not pass this Bill with their eyes shut. They will see exactly the responsibility they are incurring, and know that as soon as the Federal Government desire to make this railway, this State will be liable for an additional two millions; and every person who contemplates lending money to this State will not forget it. With these few remarks I may say that I also will support the Bill, but I do so reluctantly.

HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East): I desire to say a few words on this important measure, and in doing so I may say at the start that I agree with what has fallen from Mr. Drew with respect to the suspension of the Standing Orders. I think that a Bill like this should not be rushed through, and that we should go through the ordinary course. So far as the Bill is concerned, I think it is the desire of the vast majority of the people of this State that this railway should be built. I hope that desire will some day be realised. At the same time I do not see that there is any great prospect of having that great work constructed in the near future. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, although I do not agree with portions thereof, at least a portion—I refer amongst other things to a portion of the preamble, because I am of opinion that the statement is hardly correct. The portion to which I allude is this: "And whereas, on the faith of the early construction of a railway to connect the Western and

Eastern portions of the Commonwealth, by means whereof they could enjoy the full benefits of such union, the people of Western Australia did agree to the said Constitution, and to form part of the Commonwealth." I submit that there was really no agreement. Those who were advocating Federation made certain statements to the effect that by joining Federation this great work would probably be undertaken; but I cannot see how that is binding on the Commonwealth. If it had been agreed in the way that I would conclude that portion of the preamble would mean, I say it ought to have been a compact at the time when we entered Federation. It was simply perhaps the wishes, the statements of those on the hustings. I cannot see how that would be binding on the majority of the statesmen and politicians on the other side. With respect to Clause 4 which has been spoken about, in relation to this State constructing the portion of the line between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, I think that the objects of the line—one of the chief objects at any rate—as has been said, would be the defence of this part of the Commonwealth, and therefore it is eminently a national or Commonwealth work. Therefore I think that the Commonwealth should bear the expense of that line. But notwithstanding that, I can see perfectly clearly that if the Commonwealth have the control of that portion of the line running from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle it may affect our railways in the national aspect, and so seriously that it would perhaps pay us better to build that portion of the line and retain control of it. Whilst saying so, we have also to consider our representatives in the Commonwealth Parliament, and they no doubt are perfectly well aware, or will be as well aware as we are ourselves, that this portion of the line at any rate for some years to come will be a paying portion; and it seems to me that although it is put in the Bill as an evidence that we are serious in the matter, it may be argued in the Commonwealth Parliament that there is really nothing in the offer, and that we are sticking to the place where the whole of the traffic is. As regards the other portion of the Commonwealth line, even from the reports it will for some years to come be a very serious loss; and having regard to the difficulty of

Australia borrowing, I think it will be some considerable time before the construction of the line, or the authorisation of it, is attacked by the Commonwealth body. In addition to that we have very serious opposition by a sister State. I trust that opposition at any rate will be speedily withdrawn, and that South Australia also will pass an Enabling Bill as we are doing, so that the Commonwealth can find no excuse for not constructing the line. Although I do not think this line will be constructed for many years to come, I can only hope that my views are erroneous, and that the construction of the line will meet with the approval of and pass the Commonwealth Parliament, and they will be satisfied that it is a work they are warranted in undertaking in the interests of the Commonwealth at large. Although there will be a serious loss for some years to come, judging from the reports, still we can only hope that as time goes on it may be considerably reduced, and perhaps be speedily turned into a profit by reason of the development that will take place owing to the construction of the railway, through the advantages of the auriferous country there undoubtedly is on the way, and no doubt a large proportion of valuable pastoral and probably agricultural country which will be opened up. I shall certainly support the second reading of the Bill, but I regret that a portion of the preamble is inserted, because it will do us more harm than good.

HON. C. SOMMERS (North-East): I desire to support the second reading of this Bill. At the same time I regret the necessity to incur this expenditure, knowing, as Mr. Drew has pointed out, that there are so many works which are necessary to be carried out in the near future, and also bearing in mind the point which Sir Edward Wittenoom has raised, that the fact of our having authorised a line to cost two millions may affect our borrowing powers. On the other hand we must not forget that a great deal of advantage will accrue to the whole of the State from the construction of this line, and therefore although there are disadvantages in one sense, I think the advantages so much outweigh them that we shall be able to congratulate ourselves in the long run if we pass the Bill. I do not think there is very much more that I can say in regard

to the matter. As Dr. Hackett has pointed out, it has been very thoroughly brought before the country for some time past, and we have heard what can be said for and against it. I think that if we are in earnest, we shall pass this Bill to construct this portion of the line as soon as the Commonwealth Government are prepared to carry out their portion.

HON. W. T. LOTON (East): I desire to say that I intend for my own part to cordially support the Bill in its entirety. We cannot forget that we have entered the Commonwealth. We are part of it; but until we get better communication with the other parts of Australia we are still out of it, and we are taken advantage of in a great number of ways. With regard to the financial aspect of the question, the liability we have incurred of a million and a half to two millions, I am not inclined to think, if we have to go into the money market for other works, it will be the bugbear that is pointed out. The people who find the money will not consider that we are pledged to a two million loan until we apply for it. If we go into the market for another purpose in the first instance, the loan for that purpose will be the first consideration. The consideration of the two million loan will be a consideration when we apply for the money, and not before. Objections are raised by Mr. Drew with regard to the difficulties that the northern people and other people will labour under if we have two gauges of railway. I am afraid he has lost sight of the fact that we will still have a 3ft. 6in. gauge, and that there will be no necessity for an interchange of goods traffic. That gauge will be utilised mainly for the carriage of goods, and small trains will run on it, so there will be no difficulty in that respect. I am glad that it has dawned upon the Government to realise it will soon be necessary, independent of the question of the Trans-Australian Railway, to give some improved railway facilities between here and the goldfields. This is absolutely necessary. Private people know it, and it has at last forced itself on the view of the Government. If that be the case, looking at it practically in the interests of the State itself it would be a very short-sighted policy to allow a foreign power, I might say, to come in and build a railway in competition with our own, and to come

on these lines and take the whole of our passenger traffic and a large proportion of the light goods traffic, leaving us out in the cold. It would be the most short-sighted policy that could be imagined. On the other hand, by constructing this end of the Trans-Australian Railway as far as Kalgoorlie, we provide a means for all the traffic we have, and for an increased traffic. The very fact that the Trans-Australian Railway when completed will add to the traffic of our own line and so increase our revenue, should be an incentive to us in that respect. I do not think it is necessary to labour the question at any length. If one looks at it from a federal point of view we have nothing to say against it. If we look at it from a narrow point of view, I could myself point out in various ways where it would militate against the local interests of various portions of the State; but we must lose sight of these for the general good. It is for the general good of Australia that this railway should be constructed, and it is surely in the particular interests of this particular State; and I cannot for the life of me see why it is not for the interests of South Australia. It must open up a lot more of her country and give her facilities for this market in a most direct way; and it must suit the inhabitants of the goldfields right down to the ground. If they want to journey to the East, they will be able to get to Sydney in something like 30 to 36 hours, and with the broad gauge from Fremantle to the goldfields, as Dr. Hackett has pointed out, the time will be reduced to about one half of what it is at present. I have much pleasure in cordially supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. J. A. THOMSON (Central): As I pointed out in my speech on the Address-in-reply, I think it doubtful whether this Bill will be in the best interests of the State as a whole. I have, perhaps, very extreme views on some points; but I am very conservative on others. I am very careful wherever the interests of the people at large are at stake. I believe that this Bill will be a very serious matter indeed if this House sees fit to pass it. It authorises the Government to expend something like £2,800,000. At least it will be that amount if we are to let

the present line of rails remain there and construct new earthworks costing £10,000 per mile. It may be a very light matter for some hon. gentlemen to consider this expenditure for a population of about 200,000 odd, but to my way of thinking it is a very serious matter indeed, especially in view of the source we have of obtaining revenue for the State, mostly through the customs. The people at large in this State would have to contribute towards this extra expenditure, and I would ask hon. members just to try and think whether we are likely, if we do sanction this extra expenditure, to have an adequate return for it. Where are we going to get extra revenue? It may be said perhaps that the extra traffic this Trans-Australian Railway will bring will recoup us for the extra expenditure; but in my opinion it will not pay for many years, not perhaps in the lifetime of any hon. member. Much has been made of the fact that if we do not construct this broader gauge from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, the only option will be to allow the Federal Government to construct the Trans-Australian Railway all the way to Fremantle; but I cannot see how that will apply at all. For many years, in fact ever since the railways were constructed, there have been two gauges on New South Wales and Victorian railways. Perhaps there has been some inconvenience, but there has been no serious difficulty to overcome there. Why should we, therefore, have serious difficulties to overcome, if we retain, at all events for a time, our present system of railways, allowing the Federal Government, when they see fit to do it, which I hope and trust will be in the early future, to have their railway constructed and brought to connect with our present system? When we are in a position to have the gauge altered to run in connection with the Trans-Australian Railway, it will be well and good; but in my opinion we ought to be very careful how we commit the country to this extra expenditure. It may seem a trifle, but in my opinion there are other urgent works which would be better in the interests of the people at large in Western Australia, than to institute an expenditure for what is, in my opinion, an ideal. We have good communication at the present time

on our railway system here, and I speak with some knowledge. Our railway system under the circumstances is all that can be desired, and I have met hundreds and thousands who travel, and at least hundreds who have travelled in other parts, and they have nothing serious to complain of regarding our railway system. Why should we, in the interests of a few people who want to make travelling between here and Kalgoorlie a little more luxurious, commit the public at large to this expenditure? It is the public at large who have to find the money. It has been pointed out by some members who spoke in support of the Bill that if we do not have this broad gauge constructed from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie to connect the Trans-Australian Railway, we will lose the earnings of the most payable portion of the line; but this cannot possibly follow. We can still have the system that is in operation at the present time. There is nothing to compel us to hand it over to the Federal Government. We may still have it, and have its earnings. I hope that this matter of expending such a huge sum of money will receive the very full consideration which it deserves, and which the taxpayers at large in Western Australia will expect us to give to the Bill.

HON. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): Being a supporter of this Bill, I have carefully listened to all the arguments advanced against it, and I admire the courage of those who have expressed them; but at the same time I remain just about the same as I was when they started. It is recognised that very soon a sum of money, I will not say how much, has got to be placed on that Eastern Goldfields line, either to replace it by a 4ft. 8in. gauge or by building another line. That being the case, it appears to me that we have to look upon this, not as altogether a reproductive work, but as one of those that must be performed in order to protect our own industries in more ways than one. I think it goes without saying that we must face this matter in order that we may conserve our own interests. We should have all the earnings of this line, and have the control of it, and I think that is quite sufficient to justify some expenditure in this matter. There is another question that has been advanced against the Bill, and one which,

I think, is very easily disposed of. It is pointed out that the northern and southern lines are narrow gauge, and that all goods coming from them will have to be transferred into 4 feet 8½ inch trucks. Of this there need be no fear, for all our rolling-stock could run straight away to Kalgoorlie, notwithstanding the wider gauge there. If we are bound in that clause, or if we say we are to find this amount of money, whatever it may be, I shall fall in with it. We were induced to enter into Federation because there would be that spirit of trust, that federal spirit talked so much about, by which we should help each other and resolve ourselves into a sort of mutual-advantage community, in which we should all get fair play and look after one another's interests. That, however, has not altogether been carried out, but by this Bill we show that we are willing to do it at this end. Again, looking at it from a business point of view, we are willing to construct the railway and get earnings from it. I do not see that there is anything more to be said in favour of this work, because it will be in our own interest. It may not be a work of absolute necessity at once, but in the near future we must do it. That being the case, we shall simply have done this to protect our own interest. It is my intention to support the Bill.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East): It is not so much with the object of supporting the second reading of this Bill that I rise to make a few remarks, as to express a hope that the House will not suspend the Standing Orders and pass this measure through as the Colonial Secretary wishes. I have been always opposed to the principle of suspending the Standing Orders unless a very good and sufficient reason has been put forward. This House is generally looked upon as the House of revision, and to my mind we should keep it so. There has not been sufficient argument put forward to show that we should on this occasion suspend the Standing Orders. I approve of the Bill generally. In fact I go so far as to say it has my hearty support, and I am quite alive to the great good it will work to Western Australia, and to the whole of the Commonwealth. At the same time I am quite at one with those members who have expressed their objection to

Clause 4. To my mind Clause 4 is totally unnecessary, and it should never have been inserted in the Bill. That Clause commits us—it may commit us next week—to an expenditure of two millions. The Premier estimates that work at two millions, and I say that the clause, if it commits us to anything, commits us to an expenditure of at least two millions, for what in my opinion will not advance the building of that Trans-Australian line by one week. It is idle for members to talk about giving away our best paying lines. I would draw their attention to the fact that this is a Bill authorising the construction of a line from Kalgoorlie to South Australia, and not from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. Therefore, how will the Federal Government rob us of the traffic which is at present carried on the Eastern Goldfields line? I think there is a great deal in what has been said by Sir Edward Wittenoom, that our financiers at home will certainly remember Clause 4 when we go for future loans; they will remember that we are already committed to a farther expenditure of two millions, and there is not a shadow of a doubt that it will have a very big effect indeed on our future borrowing. I maintain that this Clause 4 should never have been inserted in the Bill. As I have already said, it will not advance the building of the Trans-Australian line by one week. If we are to have a duplication of the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, if it is necessary—and as I said in my own motion regarding the Esperance line last year, the present line will not and does not adequately carry the traffic, and it certainly will not carry it all as we extend our lines up North—if we are to have a duplication of that line let us bring in a Bill for the purpose and discuss it fairly and squarely, and not hastily commit this country to the expenditure of two millions by simply inserting a clause in this Trans-Australian Railway Bill. I again express a hope that the House will not support the Minister in his desire to have the Standing Orders suspended and this measure rushed through. I trust that the Committee stage will be postponed for a day or two, and that members will think and reflect upon that clause. The sum of two millions is a great deal of money for a country like ours, possessing

a population of only a quarter of a million. I maintain that members will do well to reflect on that clause. I most certainly would support the striking out of that clause in Committee, and I trust that the Committee stage will stand over at least for a few days until members have fully thought over the clause.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East): While I support the Bill, I find considerable fault with Clause 4. I was returned to this House pledged to support the construction of a railway to the Eastern States, but I was not pledged to the construction by the State of the first section to Kalgoorlie, and I think that at the immediate close of this Parliament it is somewhat unwise for Parliament to take into its hands the construction of so great a proportion of the railway. Seeing that the whole matter has once been before the people for the construction of the Trans-Australian line, I think it would be only a fair thing to the electors, our constituents, that we should leave this Clause 4 to stand over and take public opinion upon it before we involve the country in an expenditure of some millions of money. I believe that two millions is a fair estimate of what that portion of the railway will cost, because it is not the construction of the line alone, but rolling-stock and a lot of expenses which we at the present time may be unaware of. I think that if the matter is put before the people and an expression of opinion is given, a separate Bill which will embrace Clause 4 can be brought before the House on the mandate of the people who have to find the money, as Mr. Thomson has very forcibly put it to the House. As to the advisability at some future time of the State constructing the line from here to Kalgoorlie, I am very favourably impressed with the proposition. I do not think it is a fair thing to deal with it at the present moment. I am anxious in the interests of Western Australia, and more particularly for the sake of the goldfields, Perth, and Fremantle, that this Trans-Australian Railway shall be taken in hand by the Federal Government at the earliest possible date, and I see no particular reason yet why the railway should not be constructed by the Federal Government on some other route to the fields, opening up fresh country. That is

another aspect which requires some consideration. I think it is not reasonable to try and rush this measure through the House in one sitting, and it is not paying a compliment to the sense of the members of this Chamber. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South): I have very much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I was one of those induced to vote for Federation, and I think that of all the promises held out as to the advantages of joining the Commonwealth, the one that was most prominent was that we should soon be connected by rail with the Eastern States. With regard to the State owning part of the railway—that part from here to Kalgoorlie—I am rather in favour of the Federal Government owning all the main trunk lines from the centres of the various States. I think that if the Federal Government be any Government at all, or is to take any great interest in the government of Australia, one of their duties will be to take over the main trunk lines to all the capitals of Australia. Of course in the various States there always will be, I think, narrow gauges and cheap gauges and cheap plants running into the interior. I thought at the time I voted for Federation that part of the policy of the Federal Government would be to take over the main trunk lines to the various capitals. There is no doubt that the Trans-Australian Railway will be a very expensive affair. We have something under a couple of hundred miles already constructed on a 5ft. 3in. gauge from Adelaide to Terowie, and from Terowie to Port Augusta, about 280 miles on a 3ft. 6in. gauge; we have also a 3ft. 6in. gauge from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. I am somewhat in favour of a 3ft. 6in. gauge line. I think it is the cheapest line, and the present running of the Kalgoorlie express is not by any means a bad time; we do now 282 miles in something like 16½ hours. The Sydney express takes 17 hours, I think, to do 420 miles; so that our 3ft. 6in. gauge line compares very favourably with the 4ft. 8½in. Anyhow, that is a matter for engineers who have studied the question to decide, and I think they have decided on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge. I have not read their report, but I am wondering whether they have

taken into consideration the fact that there are a few hundred miles constructed on a 5ft. 3in. gauge. The railways in Victoria have been economically managed on that gauge, and I think generally it is admitted that a 5ft. 3in. gauge has a steadier train than a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, whilst a 4ft. 8½in. gauge has a steadier train than a 3ft. 6in. gauge. The oscillation is not so bad. I am prepared to support this measure. Members are well aware that I represent a constituency which was hoping that a shorter route than the one we have at present would have been built long ago, that is a railway from Kalgoorlie to Esperance Bay. There is no doubt that we could cut the journey in two now, if we had a railway from Kalgoorlie to Esperance. That would meet the case I think at the present time. If this Enabling Bill will do anything towards it, I am willing to support it, and I trust it will not be long before the work is taken in hand.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Power to take land :

HON. G. RANDELL: Was there any particular reason why the land to a depth of 200 feet should be given to the Commonwealth.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This was put in on the understanding of a possibility or probability perhaps that mining claims would be opened up on the route of the line, and that it was necessary to provide access underground if required, from one side of the line to the other.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—State to construct railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle :

HON. J. M. DREW moved that progress be reported.

Motion (progress) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	5
Noes	15
				—
Majority against	...			10

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. A. Thomson	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. Sir Edward Witte- noon	Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. W. Mailey (Teller).	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
	Hon. W. Kingsmill
	Hon. Z. Lane
	Hon. R. Laurie
	Hon. W. T. Loton
	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
	Hon. G. Randell
	Hon. Sir G. Shenton
	Hon. C. Sommers
	Hon. J. W. Wright
	Hon. F. M. Stone (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: The motion had been supported in order that the public might have a chance to learn the arguments used on the second reading, and to have before them clearly the result of this obligation to expend two millions. It was said that the matter had been fully discussed from every point of view; but he had seen no discussion as to the result of the State mortgaging itself to the extent of two millions of money for five years. He might be excused for dealing with this subject because he had had to deal with the late incubus of a two and a-half millions loan for the Coolgardie Water Scheme hanging over the State. That money had to be provided, and when every loan was placed on the market a sinking fund of 3 per cent. had to be provided for. We might have to go on the market at an inconvenient time and have to pay a large commission and percentage for getting the money.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill had been public property for about a fortnight, and was accurately foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech, so that the public had had ample opportunity of expressing an opinion on the matter. With regard to the urgency of the Bill, it was necessary to have a vote for the survey of the line placed on the Federal Estimates, which would be considered in a few days.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: That had not been previously mentioned.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Hon. members should put the Bill through as quickly as possible, but he would not ask that the Standing Orders be suspended. With regard to the incubus hanging over the State, that incubus would hang over whether the clause was put in the Bill or not. There was no doubt whatever that increased transport facilities would have to be given to Kalgoorlie before the

Federal Government built the Trans-Australian line.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: That could be dealt with by itself.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It should be included in this Bill for several cogent reasons. Western Australia pointed out, by the presence of the clause in the Bill, that she was ready to bear her share of the burden by constructing part of the Trans-Australian line. Whether the clause appeared in the Bill or not, a very large sum of money would have to be spent before long on the Eastern Goldfields line. The inclusion of the clause would be well considered by the other States.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Progress should have been reported in order that the public might have more time to consider this very important clause, which to his mind was totally unnecessary. It was necessary to duplicate the line to Kalgoorlie, but a separate Bill could have been brought forward for that purpose, so that the work might have been discussed thoroughly. He would support striking out the clause. It was idle for the Colonial Secretary to say that it was absolutely necessary it should appear in the Bill. From Brisbane to Adelaide there were already three breaks of gauge. Had it ever been adduced that the Federal Government would not build the line unless there was one gauge from Adelaide to Fremantle? There was no reason why there should not be a break of gauge at Kalgoorlie, as there was at the other end of the proposed line.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What would the hon. member say to the speed on the latter portion of the railway?

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: In Queensland, at the Eastern termination of a Trans-Australian line there was a narrow-gauge line. Trains ran at less speed there than they did in Western Australia. The clause would not advance the building of the line one tittle. It might be necessary to have a broad-gauge line to Kalgoorlie to cope with the traffic, but a separate Bill should be brought in for that work. Only last year, when it was thought wise to cope with the traffic to the Eastern Goldfields, it was deemed necessary to build another line, and the House, by a large majority, had passed a resolution in favour of the construction

of a line from Esperance to Kalgoorlie, so as to deal with the goldfields traffic. This clause committed the country to the expenditure of the money. It might commit us in a fortnight's time, if the Government liked to introduce a Bill. The clause said "not later than the time when the Commonwealth Parliament commences." Not later, but how much earlier might it be? This clause was nothing more nor less than an authorisation to build another railway from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: It was generally accepted by all members that we ought to do what we possibly could to advance the construction of the Trans-Australian Railway. If we accepted that, we also wanted to make the line on as perfect a system as we could, and if we were to have the up-to-date Trans-Australian Railway which would be necessary we should have the same gauge throughout, including that portion of it from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. It had been pointed out that in the other States there were different gauges. That was perfectly true, but those different States would like to wipe out the different gauges and have a uniform gauge throughout. The question of improving the present system from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie had been spoken about long since, and he thought that if the question arose to-morrow, as to whether or not the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie should be duplicated, the cry would be immediately raised, "Widen the gauge." A wide gauge was an absolute necessity. Again, the reason that this was included in the Bill was to show our *bona fides* to the people of the other side, and that on the commencement of the Trans-Australian Railway by the Federal Parliament we ourselves would do our share and make it uniform, and not have a beautiful wide gauge to Kalgoorlie and then have a narrow gauge here. The provision was a very necessary one, and he would give it his hearty support.

HON. J. M. DREW said he regretted that the Minister opposed the motion to report progress, which he considered was made in the best interests of the country, to enable the people of this State and any member of this Parliament to thoroughly consider the clause.

HON. W. MALEY: In the division which had taken place all were acting in what they considered the best interests of the State. He agreed with a good deal which had fallen from the Minister, but he could not agree that because this subject had been some months before the country, the country would be satisfied if this House passed the measure through in one sitting. There were many people in this country who looked to the Upper House to protect them in these matters, and he ventured to say the public were not unanimous about this clause. He believed there were many people in this State who were expecting and hoping that the Council would certainly have the clause excised. The delay of a few days would give the country time to express an opinion. He was, notwithstanding the very good reasons the Minister had given, very sorry the hon. gentleman did not agree to progress being reported.

HON. J. W. HACKEIT: The Committee felt that the minority were acting from a sense of conviction that they were working in the interests of the country in dividing the Committee on the motion that progress be reported. The vast majority of another place, and the vast majority of the community at large, accepted the proposition that it was necessary to keep the connection between Kalgoorlie and Fremantle and the suburban traffic in the hands of the State. We absolutely relied upon those railways to make the railway system pay. If we were satisfied on that point, everybody would know in London as well as here that we should have to borrow money to make that connection. Therefore the strictly honest thing for us to do was to put it in the forefront that we realised that this involved an expenditure to the extent of two millions. How would it look if we struck out the clause and then went to London for the next loan, not for this purpose but for some other, and explained that the country was not committed to anything. Would they not refer to these debates? Would they not ask, "Is it not a fact that you intend to construct this section yourselves?" and for good reasons we should have to admit it. They would simply ask, "Why was it struck out of the Bill in the Legislative

Council?" It was necessary that this should be in the Bill.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Dr. Hackett had conceded the point that members who took the same stand as he (Mr. Thomson) had taken were honest in their convictions. Those members conceded that the other members who had taken an opposite view were also sincere. Still, he was unconvinced that this clause was necessary. Members might just as well try to convince him that it was necessary for the Queensland Government to have their system of railways widened when the New South Wales railways were extended to the Queensland border. The traffic between Brisbane and Sydney must be many times greater than we could possibly expect the traffic on the Trans-Australian Railway to be, and surely if they were content in Queensland to have a 3ft. 6in. gauge in connection with the New South Wales railways, and also if in Victoria they were content to have a different gauge from what there was in New South Wales, it would be sufficient for us to be content with the railway system we had at the present time. If the population of this State continued to increase as it had done in the past, and it was proved to the Government then and the people at large that in the interests of this State it was necessary to have this system made uniform with the Trans-Australian system, then it would be time to have this alteration. He had no doubt whatever that the Trans-Australian Railway would be a great benefit to Western Australia; but there were many other things which would be of great benefit. We knew very well that in many outlying parts of the State it would be of great benefit to people if they could have railway communication, but the circumstances of the case did not justify the people at large of the State in giving any sanction to railway communication with certain outlying parts. The same would apply to a better system of communication with the gold-fields. But we must consider whether we were in a position to incur this enormous expenditure. The Colonial Secretary had pointed out that if we passed this Bill with the clause included it would show the people at large of the Commonwealth that we were in earnest in our endeavour to have this railway

constructed; but he (Mr Thomson) did not think it was necessary to have the clause at all. The people of the Commonwealth knew we were anxious to have this direct communication, and he took it that they were also anxious that there should be direct communication by land between Western Australia and South Australia, but they could not in justice expect that we were going to do what it was proposed we should by this clause. The Bill in itself was right, and he supported it with all his heart, but he objected to this clause, and he hoped that the members present would assist in having farther consideration of it, and would not have it passed now.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Act to cease in certain events:

HON. J. M. DREW moved that the word "five" be struck out and "three" inserted in lieu. Five years would be a long time for this contingent liability to be hanging over our heads, and three years would be ample for the Federal Parliament to come to a determination on this question.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not intend to accept the amendment. The reason which Mr. Drew had given did not appear to him to carry very much weight. Supposing we struck this word "five" out and inserted "three," it would mean that in three years even more than now we should re-enact this measure with the same Clause 6 in it, and he did not see that anything was to be gained by reducing the term of five years. The term originally proposed was 10 years, and it had been reduced to five, which he thought was quite a short enough period to give the Federal Government a chance of initiating the construction of this line before re-enacting the Bill.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6:21 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 23rd September, 1903.

	PAGE
Petition, Dr. Hungerford, retirement	1167
Questions: Advertising in English Newspapers	1167
Railway Service, Canning Mills	1168
Returns ordered: Railway Receipts, Kurrumbidgee, etc.	1168
Stock Routes, Plan with details	1168
Motions: Norseman Goldfields Railway to connect Hospitals Control and Maintenance, change system	1180
Tick Regulations, to rescind	1196
Bill: Pearlsell Fishery Act Amendment, first reading	1196

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION—DR. HUNGERFORD.

MR. YELVERTON presented a petition from Dr. L. M. Hungerford, recently Resident Magistrate at Busselton, relating to his retirement from the public service.

Petition received, and ordered to be printed.

QUESTION—ADVERTISING IN ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS.

MR. TAYLOR, for Mr. O'Connor, asked the Treasurer: 1, The names of the English papers in which advertisements were inserted. 2, The amount paid for each paper. 3, Why the Government ceased these advertisements. 4, Whether they propose to permanently discontinue them. 5, Whether they are aware that Canada is advertising all over England, and consequently absorbing all the agricultural emigrants.

THE TREASURER replied: 1 and 2, Answers £54 per annum, *Tilbitts* £50, *Pearson's Weekly* £40 16s., *Christian Herald* £58 10s., *Lloyd's Newspaper* £56 17s. 6d., *Reynold's Newspaper* £39, *British Weekly* £16 18s., *Farm, Field, and Fireside* £52, *Australian Trading World* £13, *Christian World* £26, *British Australasian*—Advertisement £100, *British Australasian*—Publishing Mining Statistics £150, *Citizen* (current) £100; total, £757 1s. 6d. per annum. 3, To enable the question of advertising to be thoroughly considered, and the best means to employ for the purpose. 4, The whole question is to receive consideration on return of the Hon. Mr. Moss, who was empowered to inquire fully into the matter. 5, The